OSEP SPP/APR Online Submission Module

Part C Collection Tools

Version 1

Released August 13, 2015

How to Read the Collection Tool

Fields in data tables can be prepopulated with data from other sources (EDFacts, eMAPS, etc), preloaded with data from previous SPP and APR submissions, calculated values, or blank fillable fields that will allow users to enter data. Cells throughout this document will be highlighted to indicate the type of field. White blank fields in data tables are fillable fields that allow users to enter data.

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Note: Narrative information around state processes provided on your previous SPP/APR will be preloaded in the narrative fields for the current SPP/APR. All of this information is editable in the system. If you do not want the narrative fields loaded with the previous year's narrative, go to the Tools page and select the "Do not preload narrative data" box.

The system will have some built in business rules and calculations. This information is described in red italic font, as is additional description of what should be provided.

- *Explanatory text*

Narrative fields will display as outlined boxes. These fields will accept rich text in the system.

Narrative field prompt

You will find a key at the bottom of each page, as you see in the footer of this page.

Introduction

Executive Summary

General Supervision System

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part C requirements are met, e.g., monitoring systems, dispute resolution systems.

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to early intervention service (EIS) programs.

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

Stakeholder Involvement:

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

Apply this to all Part C results indicators

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2013 performance of each EIS Program or Provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2013 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2013 APR in 2015, is available.

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2014-2015.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

Baseline Year:										
FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	20013
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data										

FFY 2014 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2014 Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2014 Data

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances	

The FFY 2014 data is calculated: ("Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner" plus "Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances") divided by "Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs."

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response table not including correction of noncompliance

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements	
Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance	

FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013
Add rows as needed

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 20XX			
FFY 20XY			

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Answer both of the "findings of noncompliance verified as corrected" questions for each year where you are reporting that findings have been corrected. Answer the question regarding actions taken for each year that there were findings identified that have not been verified as corrected.

FFY 20XX Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements	
Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance	

FFY 20XY Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2014-2015.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

	Baseline Year:									
FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥										
Data										

FFY 2014 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥					

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2014 Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2014 Data

FFY 2014 data is calculated: "Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings" divided by "Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs"

Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2013 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response table

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: 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); and**
   C. **Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2014-2015.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A1		Target ≥										
		Data										
A2		Target ≥										
		Data										
B1		Target ≥										
		Data										
B2		Target ≥										
		Data										
C1		Target ≥										
		Data										
C2		Target ≥										
		Data										

FFY 2014 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥					
Target A2 ≥					
Target B1 ≥					
Target B2 ≥					
Target C1 ≥					
Target C2 ≥					

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	

If the State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i), provide the numbers of all eligible children but exclude at-risk infants and toddlers (i.e., include just those infants and toddlers experiencing developmental delay (or "developmentally delayed children") or having a diagnosed physical or mental condition that has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay (or "children with diagnosed conditions"). Complete the FFY 2014 Data (At Risk Infants and Toddlers) section for this indicator.

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning		
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers		
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it		
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers		
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers		

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program *Expected calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*			
A2. 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 *Expected calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*			

Explain your different calculation methodology, if applicable

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning		

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers		
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it		
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers		
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers		

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program *Expected calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*			
B2. 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 *Expected calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*			

Explain your different calculation methodology, if applicable

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning		
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers		
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it		
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers		
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers		

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program *Expected calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*			
C2. 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 *Expected calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*			

Explain your different calculation methodology, if applicable

Was sampling used?	

If so, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

If your previously-approved sampling plan has changed, you will be asked to submit your sampling plan for approval.

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)?	

If not, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" and list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

FFY 2014 Data (At Risk Infants and Toddlers)

If your State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i), how will you separately report outcome data?

Report data on just at-risk infants and toddlers

Report aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers served under Part C (including developmentally delayed children, children with diagnosed conditions, and at-risk infants and toddlers)

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning		

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

	Number of children	Percentage of Total
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers		
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it		
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers		
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers		

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program *Expected calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*			
A2. 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 *Expected calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*			

Explain your different calculation methodology, if applicable

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning		
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers		
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it		
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers		
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers		

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program *Expected calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*			
B2. 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 *Expected calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*			

Explain your different calculation methodology, if applicable

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning		
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers		
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it		
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers		
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers		

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program *Expected calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*			
C2. 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 *Expected calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*			

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Explain your different calculation methodology, if applicable

<div style="background-color:#FBD7B0; border:1px solid #000; height:2.5em;"></div>

Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2013 response table

<div style="background-color:#FBD7B0; border:1px solid #000; height:2.5em;"></div>

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response table

<div style="border:1px solid #000; height:2.5em;"></div>

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: 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 children's needs; and**
   C.   **Help their children develop and learn.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2014-2015.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A		Target ≥										
		Data										
B		Target ≥										
		Data										
C		Target ≥										
		Data										

FFY 2014 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥					
Target B ≥					
Target C ≥					

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2014 Data

Number of respondent families participating in Part C	
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	

	FFY 2014 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights *(A1 divided by A2)*	
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs *(B1 divided by B2)*	
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn *(C1 divided by C2)*	

Was sampling used?

If so, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

If your previously-approved sampling plan has changed, you will be asked to submit your sampling plan for approval.

Was a collection tool used?

If so, is it a new or revised collection tool?

Does the data accurately represent the demographics of the State?

If it is a new or revised collection tool, you will be asked to submit a copy of the collection tool.

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2013 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response table

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2014-2015.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

	Baseline Year:										
FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤										
Data										

FFY 2014 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤					

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2014 Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2014 Data

FFY 2014 data is calculated: "Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs" divided by "Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1"

Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2013 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response table

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2014-2015.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

	Baseline Year:									
FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤										
Data										

FFY 2014 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤					

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2014 Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2014 Data

FFY 2014 data is calculated: "Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs" divided by "Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3"

Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2013 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response table

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2014-2015.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

Baseline Year:										
FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	20013
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data										

FFY 2014 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2014 Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2014 Data

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances	

FFY 2014 data is calculated: ("Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline" plus "Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances") divided by "Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted."

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2013 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response table not including correction of noncompliance

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements	
Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance	

FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

Add rows as needed

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 20XX			
FFY 20XY			

Answer both of the "findings of noncompliance verified as corrected" questions for each year where you are reporting that findings have been corrected. Answer the question regarding actions taken for each year that there were findings identified that have not been verified as corrected.

FFY 20XX Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements	
Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance	

FFY 20XY Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 8: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

    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;

    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

    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 third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2014-2015.

FFY 2014 Data: All Indicator 8 Sections

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	
Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	

8A Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

Baseline Year:										
FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	20013
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data										

FFY 2014 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

8A FFY 2014 Data

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2013 Data

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances	

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

FFY 2014 data is calculated: ("Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" plus "Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances") divided by "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C."

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and <u>services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday.</u>

If you answer "no" to this question, please provide an explanation.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

8A Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2013 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response table not including correction of noncompliance

8A Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements	
Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance	

FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

Add rows as needed

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 20XX			
FFY 20XY			

Answer both of the "findings of noncompliance verified as corrected" questions for each year where you are reporting that findings have been corrected. Answer the question regarding actions taken for each year that there were findings identified that have not been verified as corrected.

FFY 20XX Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements	
Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance	

FFY 20XY Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

8B Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

	Baseline Year:									
FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	20013
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data										

FFY 2014 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

8B FFY 2014 Data

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2013 Data

Number of parents who opted out	

FFY 2014 data is calculated: ("Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services" plus "Number of parents who opted out") divided by "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B."

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA.

If you answer "no" to this question, please provide an explanation.

Describe the method used to collect these data

If you have a written opt-out policy, is it on file with the Department?

If your opt-out policy is not on file with the Department, you will be asked to attach it.

8B Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2013 response table

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response table not including correction of noncompliance

8B Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements	
Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance	

FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

Add rows as needed

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 20XX			
FFY 20XY			

Answer both of the "findings of noncompliance verified as corrected" questions for each year where you are reporting that findings have been corrected. Answer the question regarding actions taken for each year that there were findings identified that have not been verified as corrected.

FFY 20XX Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements	
Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance	

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

8C Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

Baseline Year:										
FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	20013
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data										

FFY 2014 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

8C FFY 2014 Data

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2013 Data

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference	
Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances	

FFY 2014 data is calculated: ("Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" plus "Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference" plus "Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances") divided by "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B."

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has 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 third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

If you answer "no" to this question, please provide an explanation.

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

8C Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2013 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response table not including correction of noncompliance

8C Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements	
Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance	

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

Add rows as needed

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 20XX			
FFY 20XY			

Answer both of the "findings of noncompliance verified as corrected" questions for each year where you are reporting that findings have been corrected. Answer the question regarding actions taken for each year that there were findings identified that have not been verified as corrected.

FFY 20XX Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements	
Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance	

FFY 20XY Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: 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). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2014-2015.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

Baseline Year:										
FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥										
Data										

FFY 2014 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥					

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2014 Data

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2014 Data

The FFY 2014 data is calculated: "3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements" divided by "3.1 Number of resolutions sessions"

Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2013 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response table

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 10: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2014-2015.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

Baseline Year:										
FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥										
Data										

FFY 2014 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥					

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2014 Data

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2014 Data

The FFY 2014 data is calculated: ("2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints" + "2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints") divided by "2.1 Number of mediations held"

Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2013 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response table

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

Baseline Year:	**2013**
FFY	2013
Target ≥	
Data	

FFY 2014 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥					

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., EIS program and/or EIS provider, geographic region, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, etc.) As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in EIS programs and/or EIS providers to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and other early learning initiatives, such as Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge and the Home Visiting program and describe the extent that these new initiatives are aligned, and how they

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP.

A description of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child- or family-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increase the rate of growth in infants and toddlers demonstrating positive social-emotional skills) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increase the percentage reported under child outcome B under Indicator 3 of the SPP/APR (knowledge and skills) and increase the percentage trend reported for families under Indicator 4 (helping their child develop and learn)).

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families. The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support EIS program and/or EIS provider implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified result(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build EIS program and/or EIS provider capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in EIS programs and/or EIS providers, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Optional Description

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Infrastructure Development

(a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

(b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

(c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.

(d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

(a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

(b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.

(c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Evaluation

(a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

(b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.

(c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).

(d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.