| **Indicators** | **Data Source** | | **How will this Indicator be Measured?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Data base** | **Other** |
| 1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.  **(SPP/APR Indicator #1)** | X |  | **Data Source:**  Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Include the State’s criteria for “timely” receipt of early intervention services, i.e., Services provided on or before the IFSP services initiation date.  **Measurement:**  Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.  Account for untimely receipt of services. |
| 2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.  **(SPP/APR Indicator #2)** | 618 (Annual Report of Children Served) |  | **Measurement:**  Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100. |
| 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); and  C. use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.  **(SPP/APR Indicator #3)** | X |  | **Data Source:**  Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system for all children exited in the fiscal year who received both initial and exit ratings.  **Measurement:**   1. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships).   a. Percent of infants and toddlerswho did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlerswho did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlerswith IFSPs assessed)] times 100.  b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.  c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.  d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.  e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.  If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference**.**  B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy).  a. Percent of infants and toddlerswho did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlerswho did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlerswith IFSPs assessed)] times 100.  b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.  c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.  d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.  e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.  If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference**.**  C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.  a. Percent of infants and toddlerswho did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlerswho did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlerswith IFSPs assessed)] times 100.  b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.  c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.  d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.  e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.  If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference**.** |
| 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 children's needs; and  C. help their children develop and learn.  **(SPP/APR Indicator #4)** |  | Annual Survey | **Data Source:**  Statewide Family Outcomes Survey.  **Measurement:**  A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.  B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.  C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100. |
| 5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.  **(SPP/APR Indicator #5)** | 618 data (Annual Report of Children Served) |  | **Measurement:**  Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to national data. |
| 6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.  **(SPP/APR Indicator #6)** | 618 data (Annual Report of Children Served) |  | **Measurement:**  Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to national data. |
| 7. 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.  **(SPP/APR Indicator #7)** | X |  | **Data Source:**  Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must address timeline from point of referral to initial IFSP meeting based on actual, not an average, number of days.  **Measurement:**  Percent = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.  Account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays. |
| 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 child potentially eligible for Part B; and  C. transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.  **(SPP/APR Indicator #8)** | X |  | **Data Source:**  Data to be taken from monitoring or state data system.  **Measurement:**   1. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C)] times 100. 2. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100. 3. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred 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) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.   Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, B, and C, including the reasons for delays. |
| 9. Percent of noncompliance findings (identified through monitoring and complaints/ hearings) that are corrected within one year.  **(this is a modified version of SPP/APR Indicator #9)** | X | Annual EI/ILP provider reports, annual monitoring reports, complaint logs, hearing documentation. | The state determines for each program the percent of findings of noncompliance that were corrected in a timely manner. (The state is required to report in the SPP/APR the number of EIS programs monitored using different components of the State’s general supervision system.)  **Data Source:**  Data to be taken from State database, monitoring reports/annual compliance findings and complaints/hearings. Indicate the number of EIS programs monitored and the number of programs with complaints.  **Measurement:**  Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:   1. # of findings of noncompliance 2. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.   Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.  For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken. |
| 14. Percent of EI/ILP program reported data (child count and exiting data, monthly data entry, contract submission requirements, CAPs, etc.) that are timely.  **(this is a modified version of SPP/APR Indicator #14)** | X | Child Count Data Report Documentation, APR Reporting Documentation (date of report submission). | **Measurement (Locals report to state):**   1. December 1st Child count and exiting data 2. Data entry for each child, quarterly narrative reports and data verification: October 30, January 30, April 30, July 30 3. Personnel List 4. Self-Assessment Data: June 30 5. Corrective Action Plans/Improvement Plans: 30 days after receipt of written identification of noncompliance by the state following onsite visit, findings from complaint investigations, etc. 6. Corrective Action Plan Progress Reports: as specified in each CAP’s evidence of change statement (specified by the state).   **State Data Reported to OSEP in APR:**  **Data Source:**  State selected data sources, including data from the state data system, as well as technical assistance and monitoring systems.  **Measurement:**  State reported data, including 618 data, state performance plan, and annual performance reports, are:   1. submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, settings and November 1 for exiting, personnel, dispute resolution); and 2. accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring error free, consistent, valid and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met). |

| **Indicators** | **Data Source** | | | **How will this Indicator be Measured?** | **Target** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Data base** | **Other** | |
| **Program Management** | | | | | |
| 1. Percent of families that receive procedural safeguards at appropriate times including:  A. written prior notice provided to families before proposing or refusing to initiate or change the identification, evaluation, or placement of the child or the provision of EI services to the child and family (e.g., with screening results, prior to evaluations/ assessments, with eligibility determination, prior to IFSP meetings);  B. parent consent obtained prior to initial evaluation/assessment and screening;  C. parent consent obtained prior to implementing IFSP services; and  D. information provided to families in the native language or mode of communication unless clearly not feasible to do so. | X | | Self- Assessment File Review Checklist | **Measurement (Current)**  **A. Percent of families that receive written prior notice before proposing or refusing to initiate or change the identification, evaluation, or placement of the child or the provision of EI services to the child and family (e.g., with screening results, prior to evaluations/ assessments, with eligibility determination, prior to IFSP meetings).**  Programs will use a random sample of children’s records to complete their self-assessment to respond to this indicator. The date on the copy of the written prior notice form is compared with the date of each action requiring prior notice (e.g., prior to screening and evaluation/ assessment, following screening if evaluation/assessment will not be provided, at eligibility determination, prior to IFSP meetings and providing IFSP services) that occurred to ensure the notice is provided at appropriate times.  **Program:**  Percent = # of children’s records where the date that prior written notice was provided is before the date of each action where notice is required divided by the total number of records sampled.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide:**  Percent = # of children’s records where families at received prior written notice before the required action was taken divided by the total number of children’s records reviewed statewide in completing the self-assessment.  B. **Percent of families that provide parental consent prior to initial evaluation/assessment and screening.**  Programs will use a random sample of children’s records to complete their self-assessment to respond to this indicator. The date on the copy of the most recent consent for evaluation/assessment is compared with the date of those evaluations/assessments that are provided to determine if consent was provided prior to the action.  **Program:**  Percent = # of children’s records where the date of consent for evaluation/assessment is before the date of each evaluation/ assessment conducted divided by the total number of records sampled.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide:**  Percent = # of children’s records where families provided consent for evaluation/assessment and/or screening prior to these being completed divided by the total number of children’s records reviewed statewide in completing the self-assessment.  **C. Percent of families that provide parental consent prior to implementing IFSP services.**  Programs will use a random sample of children’s records to complete their self-assessment to respond to this indicator. The date of parent signature on the IFSP is compared with the date each service is first provided (see data collected in Indicator #1).  Percent = # of children where the date of consent for IFSP services (parent signature on IFSP) is before the date of the provision of services divided by the total number of children with one or more services provided.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide:**  Percent = # of children’s records where families provided consent for implementing IFSP services prior to services being provided divided by the total number of children’s records reviewed statewide in completing the self-assessment.  **On-site Verification:**  State randomly selects records (including some records that the program reviewed for the self-assessment) and uses file review checklist to confirm accuracy of data entry (e.g., compares self-assessment results with child records reviewed during on-site monitoring). | 100% |
| 2. Percent of children who receive early intervention services from a collaborative team when:  A. conducting evaluation and assessment ;  B. developing the IFSP; and  C. providing early intervention services. | X  (Contact Log) | | Self- Assessment File Review Checklist | **Measurement:**  Programs will use a random sample of children’s records to complete their self-assessment to respond to this indicator.  **A. Percent of children who receive evaluation and assessment from a collaborative team.**  Programs will use a random sample of children’s records to complete their self-assessment to respond to this indicator. Reviewers look for documentation in the child’s record where two of more disciplines or professions are involved in conducting the evaluation and assessment of the child.  **Program:**  **Percent =** # of children’s records that show documentation of two or more disciplines or professions involved in conducting the evaluation and assessment of the child divided by the total number of records reviewed.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide:**  Percent = # of children’s records that show documentation of two or more disciplines or professions involved in conducting the evaluation and assessment of the child divided by the total number of records reviewed statewide in completing the self-assessment.  **B. Percent of children who’s IFSP was developed by a collaborative team.**  Programs will use a random sample of children’s records to complete their self-assessment to respond to this indicator. Reviewers look for documentation in the child’s record where two of more disciplines or professions are involved in developing the child’s IFSP.  **Program:**  **Percent =** # of children’s records that show documentation of two or more disciplines or professions involved in developing the child’s IFSPs divided by the total number of records reviewed.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide:**  Percent = # of children’s records that show documentation of two or more disciplines or professions involved in developing the child’s IFSPs divided by the total number of records reviewed statewide in completing the self-assessment.  **C. Percent of children whose early interventions services were provided by a collaborative team.**  Programs will use a random sample of children’s records to complete their self-assessment to respond to this indicator. Reviewers look for documentation in the child’s record where two of more disciplines or professions are involved in providing early intervention services listed on the child’s IFSP. The reviewer should look at contact notes that reflect communication between team members, especially the family service coordinator and service providers. Frequency of communication and collaboration between team members will vary, depending on needs of children and families. Quarterly is a minimum expectation. However, collaboration may be difficult if there is only one service being provided and that same person is the family service coordinator.  **Program:**  **Percent =** # of children’s records that show documentation of two or more disciplines or professions involved in providing early intervention services divided by the total number of records reviewed.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide:**  Percent = # of children’s records that show documentation of two or more disciplines or professions involved in providing early intervention services divided by the total number of records reviewed statewide in completing the self-assessment.  **Onsite Verification:**  State pulls information from data base on number of contacts documented and compares with contact log documentation in the child’s record. In addition, the State randomly selects records (including some records that the program reviewed for the self-assessment) and uses file review checklist to confirm accuracy of data entry (e.g., compares self-assessment results with child records reviewed during on-site monitoring). |  |
| **Qualified Personnel** | | | | | |
| 3. Percent of personnel who are hired and trained according to AK personnel standards including:  A. personnel hired who meet state standards; and  B. personnel hired who are oriented on program mission, procedures and practices (e.g., teaming, IFSP process, service provision, procedural safeguards and documentation). | X  (State Data Base) | | X  (SEED Registry) | 1. **Percent of personnel hired who meet state standards.**   This indicator helps determine whether or not the agency complies with requirements related to hiring and recruiting personnel.  **Measurement:**  Programs report all staff hired to the state, including job descriptions and resumes and enter data into data base. State staff review data base monthly for trends and on an annual basis use the data and required state reports for monitoring purposes.  **Program:**  Percent = # of staff hired who meet state standards divided by all EI/ILP staff in the program.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide:**  Percent = # of staff hired who meet state standards divided all EI/ILP staff in the state.  **Onsite Verification:**  State staff has data base report on personnel and compares with onsite personnel records to confirm accurate data entry (e.g., compares database results with personnel records reviewed during on-site monitoring).   1. **Percent of personnel hired who are oriented on program mission, procedures and practices (e.g., teaming, IFSP process, service provision, procedural safeguards, documentation).**   This indicator helps determine if an agency is orienting new personnel as required.  **Measurement:**  Programs submit training plan for new staff hired and indicate in data base when orientation has been completed.  **Program:**  Percent = # of new staff hired who received orientation divided by all newly hired EI/ILP staff in the program.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide**  Percent = # of new staff hired who received orientation divided by all newly hired EI/ILP staff in the state.  **Onsite Verification:**  State staff uses data base report on new personnel who received orientation and compares this data with onsite personnel records to confirm accuracy of data entry (e.g., compares database results with personnel records reviewed during on-site monitoring). |  |
| **Assessment/Evaluation** | | | | | |
| 4. Percent of child outcomes ratings in the three areas that are:  A. supported by corresponding documentation of evaluation/assessment and parent report; and  B. entered in the EI/ILP data base and that match the completed COSF. | X  (Outcomes Page) | | X  Self-assessment | **Measurement:**  **A. Percent of child outcomes ratings in the three areas that are supported by the evaluation and assessment results and parent report.**  Programs complete the COSF for all children at entry, annually and at exit and include information about the child’s functional skills from evaluations/assessments (including parent report) to substantiate the rating in each of the three areas.  **Program:**  Percent = # of child outcomes ratings that are supported by the evaluation/assessment results (including parent report) in each of the three areas divided by the number of children’s COSFs that are reviewed for the program.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide:**  Percent = # of child outcomes ratings that are supported by the evaluation/assessment results (including parent report) in each of the three areas divided by the number of children’s COSFs that are reviewed statewide.  **Onsite Verification:**  State randomly selects children’s COSF to review and determine if justification including evaluation/assessment results and parent report reflect the ratings and compares with self-assessment.  **B. Percent of child outcomes ratings where the COSF matches the data entered in the data base.**  Programs enter COSF data into the data base.  **Program:**  Percent = # of children whose COSF information matches the data entry divided by the number of children’s COSFs that are reviewed for the program.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide:**  Percent = the number of children whose COSF information matches the data entry divided by the number of children’s COSFs that are reviewed statewide.  **Onsite Verification**  State pulls report of Outcomes rating from data base, compares with COSF form for randomly selected children to ensure accuracy of data entry when onsite and self-assessment. |  |
| 5. Percent of children whose assessments are of high quality as demonstrated by:  A. the team determining developmental levels in all areas;  B. the team reviewing health and medical background and determining the status of vision and hearing;  C. the team determining functional skills;  D. the team focusing on previous areas of strengths and needs when previous evaluation and assessment was conducted;  E. the team identifying progress in growth and development when conducting re-evaluation and assessment;  F. the team incorporating information from the family assessment and family input in the evaluation/assessment process; and  G. the team incorporating family assessment information (e.g., family concerns, priorities, resources and information about everyday routines and activities). |  | | Self-assessment File Review Checklist | **Measurement:**   * + 1. **Percent of children whose assessments are of high quality as demonstrated by the team determining developmental levels in all areas.**   Programs will use a random sample of children’s records to complete their self-assessment to respond to this indicator.  **Program:**  Percent =# of children’s records that demonstrate assessments determine developmental levels in all areas divided by the total number of records reviewed.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide:**  Percent = # of children’s records demonstrate assessments determine developmental levels in all areas divided by the total number of records reviewed statewide in completing the self-assessment.   * + 1. **Percent of children whose assessments are of high quality as demonstrated by the team reviewing health and medical background and determining status of vision and hearing.**   Programs will use a random sample of children’s records to complete their self-assessment to respond to this indicator.  **Program:**  Percent =# of children’s records that demonstrate assessments include review of health and medical background and determine status of vision and hearing divided by the total number of records reviewed.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide:**  Percent = # of children’s records demonstrate assessments include review of health and medical background and determine status of vision and hearing divided by the total number of records reviewed statewide in completing the self-assessment.   * + 1. **Percent of children whose assessments are of high quality as demonstrated by the team determining functional skills.**   Programs will use a random sample of children’s records to complete their self-assessment to respond to this indicator.  **Program:**  Percent = # of children’s records that demonstrate assessments determine functional skills divided by the total number of records reviewed.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide:**  Percent = # of children’s records demonstrate assessments determine functional divided by the total number of records reviewed statewide in completing the self-assessment.   * + 1. **Percent of children whose assessments are of high quality as demonstrated by the team focusing on previous areas of strengths and needs when previous evaluation and assessment was conducted.**   Programs will use a random sample of children’s records to complete their self-assessment to respond to this indicator.  **Program:**  Percent =# of children’s records that demonstrate re-evaluations focus on previous areas of strengths and needs divided by the total number of records reviewed.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide:**  Percent = # of children’s records demonstrate re-evaluations focus on previous areas of strengths and needs divided by the total number of records reviewed statewide in completing the self-assessment.   * + 1. **Percent of children whose assessments are of high quality as demonstrated by the team identifying progress in growth and development when conducting re-evaluation and assessment.**   Programs will use a random sample of children’s records to complete their self-assessment to respond to this indicator.  **Program:**  Percent =# of children’s records that demonstrate re-evaluations identify progress in growth and development divided by the total number of records reviewed.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide:**  Percent = # of children’s records demonstrate re-evaluations identify progress in growth and development divided by the total number of records reviewed statewide in completing the self-assessment.   * + 1. **Percent of children whose assessments are of high quality as demonstrated by the team incorporating family input in the evaluation/assessment**.   Programs will use a random sample of children’s records to complete their self-assessment to respond to this indicator.  **Program:**  Percent =# of children’s records that demonstrate family is incorporated into assessments divided by the total number of records reviewed.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide:**  Percent = # of children’s records demonstrate family input is incorporated into assessments divided by the total number of records reviewed statewide in completing the self-assessment.   * + 1. **Percent of children whose assessments are of high quality as demonstrated by the team incorporating family assessment information (e.g., family concerns, priorities, resources and information about everyday routines and activities).**   Programs will use a random sample of children’s records to complete their self-assessment to respond to this indicator.  **Program:**  Percent =# of children’s records that demonstrate family information is use in planning and conducting assessments divided by the total number of records reviewed.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide:**  Percent = # of children’s records demonstrate family information is use in planning and conducting assessments divided by the total number of records reviewed statewide in completing the self-assessment.  **Onsite Verification:**  State randomly selects records (including some records that the program reviewed for the self-assessment) and uses file review checklist to confirm accuracy of data entry. |  |
| **IFSP Development** | | | | | |
| 6. Percent of children who have high quality IFSPs that drive services and include:  A. outcomes that are measurable;  B. outcomes that are related to family priorities, concerns and resources;  C. outcomes that are designed to build family capacity;  D. outcomes that are functional and reflect the child and family’s every day routines and activities;  E. outcomes that reflect present levels of development;  F. timely review and renewal according to requirements; and  G. needed services and supports. |  | | Self-assessment File Review Checklist and  Family Survey | **Measurement:**   1. **Percent of children who have high quality IFSPs that include outcomes that are measurable.**   Programs will use a random sample of children’s records to complete their self-assessment to respond to this indicator.  **Program:**  Percent = # of children’s records where IFSPs include outcomes that are measurable divided by the total number of records reviewed.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide:**  Percent = # of children’s records where IFSPs include outcomes that are measurable divided by the total number of records reviewed statewide in completing the self-assessment.   1. **Percent of children who have high quality IFSPs that include outcomes that are related to family priorities, concerns and resources**.   Programs will use a random sample of children’s records to complete their self-assessment to respond to this indicator.  **Program:**  Percent = # of children’s records where IFSPs include outcomes that are related to family priorities, concerns and resources divided by the total number of records reviewed.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide:**  Percent = # of children’s records where IFSPs include outcomes that are related to family priorities, concerns and resources divided by the total number of records reviewed statewide in completing the self-assessment.   1. **Percent of children who have high quality IFSPs that include outcomes that are designed to build family capacity**.   Programs will use a random sample of children’s records to complete their self-assessment to respond to this indicator.  **Program:**  Percent = # of children’s records where IFSPs include outcomes that are designed to build family capacity divided by the total number of records reviewed.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide:**  Percent = # of children’s records where IFSPs include outcomes that are designed to build family capacity divided by the total number of records reviewed statewide in completing the self-assessment.   1. **Percent of children who have high quality IFSPs that include outcomes that are functional and reflect the child and family’s everyday routines and activities.**   Programs will use a random sample of children’s records to complete their self-assessment to respond to this indicator.  **Program**:  Percent = # of children’s records where IFSPs include outcomes that are functional and reflect the child and family’s everyday routines and activities divided by the total number of records reviewed.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide:**  Percent = # of children’s records where IFSPs include outcomes that functional and reflect the child and family’s everyday routines and activities divided by the total number of records reviewed statewide in completing the self-assessment.   1. **Percent of children who have high quality IFSPs that include outcomes that reflect present levels of development.**   Programs will use a random sample of children’s records to complete their self-assessment to respond to this indicator.  **Program:**  Percent = # of children’s records where IFSPs include outcomes that are functional and reflect present levels of development divided by the total number of records reviewed.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide:**  Percent = # of children’s records where IFSPs include outcomes that reflect present levels of development divided by the total number of records reviewed statewide in completing the self-assessment.   1. **Percent of children who have high quality IFSPs that include timely review and renewal according to requirements.**   Programs will use a random sample of children’s records to complete their self-assessment to respond to this indicator.  **Program:**  Percent = # of children’s records where IFSPs are reviewed in a timely manner in accordance with requirements divided by the total number of records reviewed.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide:**  Percent = # of children’s records where IFSPs are reviewed in a timely manner in accordance with requirements divided by the total number of records reviewed statewide in completing the self-assessment.   1. **Percent of children who have high quality IFSPs that include needed services and supports.**   Programs will use a random sample of children’s records to complete their self-assessment to respond to this indicator.  **Program:**  Percent = # of children’s records where IFSPs include needed services and supports divided by the total number of records reviewed.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide:**  Percent = # of children’s records where IFSPs include needed services and supports divided by the total number of records reviewed statewide in completing the self-assessment.  **Onsite Verification:**  State randomly selects records (including some records that the program reviewed for the self-assessment) and uses file review checklist to confirm accuracy of data entry. |  |
| **IFSP Implementation** | | | | | |
| 7. Percent of children whose services provided reflect the outcomes on the IFSP including:  A. service contacts correlate with frequency and intensity of services indicated on the IFSP;  B. service summaries reflect activities related to IFSP outcomes and strategies; and  C. when services are missed, every effort is made to reschedule the visit and/or IFSP is updated to reflect changes in frequency/ intensity of services as appropriate.[[1]](#footnote-1) |  | | Self-assessment File Review Checklist | **Measurement:**   1. **Percent of children whose service contacts correlate with frequency and intensity of services indicated on the IFSP.**   Programs use Self-assessment File Review Checklist and check for the completion of the above item in each child’s record.  **Program:**  Percent = # of children’s records where service contacts correlate with the frequency and intensity of services indicated on the IFSP divided by all children whose records were reviewed by the program.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide:**  Percent = # of children’s records where service contacts correlate with the frequency and intensity of services indicated on the IFSP divided by all children whose records were reviewed across all agencies.   1. **Percent of children whose service summaries reflect activities related to IFSP outcomes and strategies.**   Programs use Self-assessment File Review Checklist and check for the completion of the above item in each child’s record.  **Program:**  Percent = # of children’s records where service summaries reflect activities related to IFSP outcomes and strategies divided by all children whose records were reviewed by the program.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide:**  Percent = # of children’s records where service summaries reflect activities related to IFSP outcomes and strategies divided by all children whose records were reviewed across all agencies.   1. **Percent of children who have service visits rescheduled whenever possible when the visit is missed and/or their IFSP is updated to reflect changes in frequency/ intensity of services as appropriate.**   Programs use Self-assessment File Review Checklist and check for the completion of the item in each child’s record. This item should be reviewed only if services are missed as identified in A above.  **Program:**  Percent = # of children’s records that demonstrate when services are missed, every effort is made to reschedule the visit and/or IFSP is updated to reflect changes in frequency/ intensity of services as appropriate divided by all children whose records were reviewed by the program.  State compiles data across all programs to determine statewide performance.  **Statewide:**  Percent = # of children’s records that demonstrate when services are missed, every effort is made to reschedule the visit and/or IFSP is updated to reflect changes in frequency/ intensity of services as appropriate divided by all children whose records were reviewed across all agencies.  **Onsite Verification:**  State randomly selects records (including some records that the program reviewed for the self-assessment) and uses file review checklist to confirm accuracy of data entry. |  |

1. This sub- indicator should be reviewed only if service contacts do not correlate with frequency and intensity of services on the IFSP. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)