

Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (Part C SPP/APR)

Part C Indicator Measurement Table

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
<p>1. Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Family Service Plans (IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)</p>	<p>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>i.e.</i>, the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).</p> <p>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, including the reasons for delays.</p>	<p><i>If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select early intervention service (EIS) programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.</i></p> <p>Targets must be 100%.</p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. States report in both the numerator and denominator under Indicator 1 on the number of children for whom the State ensured the timely initiation of new services identified on the IFSP. Include the timely initiation of new early intervention services from both initial IFSPs and subsequent IFSPs. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.</p> <p>The State's timeliness measure for this indicator must be either: (1) a time period that runs from when the parent consents to IFSP services; or (2) the IFSP initiation date (established by the IFSP Team, including the parent).</p> <p>States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		<p>family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child’s record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.</p> <p>Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in the Office of Special Education Programs’ (OSEP’s) response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.</p> <p>If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance. Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its EIS programs/providers to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction) the explanation within each applicable indicator, must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the EIS program/provider has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory</p>

		requirements.
<p>2. 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)</p>	<p>Data Source: Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).</p> <p>Measurement:</p>	<p><i>Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.</p> <p>The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's 618 data reported in Table 2. If not, explain.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	<p>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.</p>	
<p>3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)</p>	<p>Data Source: State selected data source.</p> <p>Measurement: Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>Progress categories for A, B and C:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with 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 	<p><i>Sampling of infants and toddlers with IFSPs is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See <u>General Instructions</u> page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)</i></p> <p>In the measurement, include in the numerator and denominator only infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.</p> <p>Report: (1) the number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State’s Part C exiting data under Section 618 of the IDEA; and (2) the number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.</p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements.</p> <p>Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.</p> <p>In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.” If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Process (COS), then the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” has</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	<p>nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:</p> <p>Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.</p> <p>Measurement for Summary Statement 1:</p> <p>Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in category (d)) divided by (# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d))] times 100.</p> <p>Summary Statement 2: The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age</p>	<p>been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.</p> <p>In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.</p> <p>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), the State must report data in two ways. First, it must report on all eligible children but exclude its at-risk infants and toddlers (<i>i.e.</i>, 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")). Second, the State must separately report outcome data on either: (1) just its at-risk infants and toddlers; or (2) aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C (including developmentally delayed children, children with diagnosed conditions, and at-risk infants and toddlers).</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	<p>expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.</p> <p>Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e)) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.</p>	
<p>4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:</p> <p>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)</p>	<p>Data Source: State selected data source. State must describe the data source in the SPP/APR.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p><i>Sampling of families participating in Part C is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See <u>General Instructions</u> page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)</i></p> <p>Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.</p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.</p> <p>While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.</p> <p>Report the number of families to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent families participating in Part C. The survey response rate is auto calculated using the submitted data.</p> <p>States will be required to compare the current year's response rate to the previous year(s) response rate(s), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.</p> <p>The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		<p>from a broad cross section of families that received Part C services.</p> <p>Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers receiving services in the Part C program. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of infant or toddler, and geographic location in the State.</p> <p>States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).</p> <p>If the analysis shows that the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are not representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers receiving services in the Part C program, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to families (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person), if a survey was used, and how responses were collected.</p> <p>The State must include in its analysis the extent to which the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Part C program. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: socioeconomic status, parents or guardians whose primary language is other than English and who have limited English proficiency, maternal education, geographic location, and/or</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		<p>another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.</p> <p>States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.</p>

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C

Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
<p>5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p>	<p>Data Source: Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the ED<i>Facts</i> Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)) and Census (for the denominator).</p> <p>Measurement: Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100.</p>	<p><i>Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.</p> <p>The State should conduct root cause analysis of child find identification rates, including reviewing data (if available) on the number of children referred, evaluated, and identified. This analysis may include examining not only demographic data but also other child-find related data available to the State (e.g., geographic location, family income, primary language, etc.). The State should report the results of this analysis under the "Additional Information" section of this indicator. If the State is required to report on the reasons for slippage, the State <u>must</u> include the results of its analyses under the "Additional Information" section of this indicator.</p>
<p>6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p>	<p>Data Source: Data collected under IDEA section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the ED<i>Facts</i> Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)) and Census (for the denominator).</p>	<p><i>Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.</p>

	<p>Measurement:</p> <p>Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100.</p>	<p>The State should conduct root cause analysis of child find identification rates, including reviewing data (if available) on the number of children referred, evaluated, and identified. This analysis may include examining not only demographic data but also other child-find related data available to the State (e.g., geographic location, family income, primary language, etc.). The State should report the results of this analysis under the “Additional Information” section of this indicator. If the State is required to report on the reasons for slippage, the State <u>must</u> include the results of its analysis under the “Additional Information” section of this indicator.</p>
<p>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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p>	<p>Data Source:</p> <p>Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must address the timeline from point of referral to initial IFSP meeting based on actual, not an average, number of days.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>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) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.</p> <p>Account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.</p>	<p><i>If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.</i></p> <p>Targets must be 100%.</p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.</p> <p>States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 303.310(b), documented in the child’s record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers</p>

		<p>the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.</p> <p>Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.</p> <p>If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance. Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its EIS programs/providers to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction) the explanation within each applicable indicator, must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the EIS program/provider has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.</p>
--	--	---

Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
<p>8. The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:</p> <p>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;</p> <p>B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (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</p> <p>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.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p>	<p>Data Source:</p> <p>Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have 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 their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.</p> <p>B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt- out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.</p> <p>C. 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, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.</p>	<p>Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.</p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.</p> <p>Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.</p> <p>Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 303.310(b), documented in the child’s record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.</p> <p>Indicator 8B: Under 34 C.F.R. § 303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 C.F.R. § 303.209(b)(1) and</p>

		<p>(2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to “opt-out” of the referral. Under the State’s opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State’s Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 C.F.R. §§ 303.209(b) and 303.401(d).</p> <p>Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.</p> <p>Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.</p> <p>Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.</p> <p>If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance. Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State</p>
--	--	---

		<p>did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its EIS programs/providers to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction) the explanation within each applicable indicator, must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the EIS program/provider has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.</p>
--	--	---

Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
<p>9. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures under section 615 of the IDEA are adopted). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p>	<p>Data Source: Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED<i>Facts</i> Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).</p> <p>Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.</p>	<p><i>Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.</i></p> <p>This indicator is not applicable to a State that has adopted Part C due process procedures under section 639 of the IDEA.</p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.</p> <p>States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.</p> <p>States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).</p> <p>If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data, explain.</p> <p>States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.</p>
<p>10. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p>	<p>Data Source: Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED<i>Facts</i> Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).</p> <p>Measurement:</p>	<p><i>Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.</p> <p>States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10.</p>

	<p>Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.</p>	<p>In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.</p> <p>The consensus among mediation practitioners is that 75-85% is a reasonable rate of mediations that result in agreements and is consistent with national mediation success rate data. States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).</p> <p>If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data, explain.</p> <p>States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.</p>
--	--	--

INDICATOR 11 – STATE SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENT
PLAN

MONITORING PRIORITY – GENERAL SUPERVISION

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

MEASUREMENT: The State’s SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE INDICATOR/MEASUREMENT –

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State’s FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State’s baseline data.

Updated data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

OVERVIEW OF THE THREE PHASES OF THE SSIP: It is of the utmost importance to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families by improving early intervention services. Stakeholders, including parents of infants and toddlers with disabilities, early intervention service (EIS) programs and providers, the State Interagency Coordinating Council, and others, are critical participants in improving results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and must be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State’s targets under Indicator 11. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above):

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for EIS Program and/or EIS Provider Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above):

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the

SSIP. SPECIFIC CONTENT OF EACH PHASE OF THE SSIP

Refer to FFYs 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and Their Families (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

(A) Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APRs, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

(B) Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2024). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2023 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be attained during FFY 2024, i.e., July 1, 2024-June 30, 2025).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring

data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

(C) Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2023 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2024, i.e., July 1, 2024- June 30, 2025) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

INDICATOR 12 – General Supervision

MONITORING PRIORITY – GENERAL SUPERVISION

INDICATOR: This SPP/APR indicator focuses on the State lead agency’s exercise of its general supervision responsibility to monitor its Early Intervention Service (EIS) Providers and EIS Programs¹ for requirements under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) through the State’s reporting on timely correction of noncompliance (20 U.S.C. 1416(a) and 1435(a)(10); 34 C.F.R. §§ 303.120 and 303.700).

In reporting on findings under this indicator, the State must include findings from data collected through all components of the State’s general supervision system that are used to identify noncompliance. This includes, but is not limited to, information collected through State monitoring, State database/data system dispute resolution, and fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which noncompliance is identified by the State.

MEASUREMENT: This SPP/APR indicator requires the reporting on the:

Percent of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance issued in the prior Federal fiscal year (FFY) (e.g., for FFY 2022 July 1, 2022 - June 30, 2023)
- b. # of findings of noncompliance the State verified were corrected no later than one year after the State’s written notification of findings of noncompliance

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100

States are required to complete the General Supervision Data Table (see template below) within the online reporting tool.

¹ Throughout this indicator, OSEP uses both the term early intervention service (EIS) provider and EIS program because State Lead Agencies issue findings by EIS provider and/or EIS program. The State should include, as part of its description of its monitoring system, how it is reporting findings under this indicator: by EIS provider and/or EIS program. Early intervention service provider is defined in 34 C.F.R. § 303.12 to include an entity (whether public, private, or nonprofit) or an individual that provides early intervention services under part C of the Act, and may include where appropriate, the lead agency and public agency responsible for providing early intervention services to infants and toddlers with disabilities in the State under Part C of the Act. EIS program is defined in 34 C.F.R. § 303.11, meaning an entity designated by the lead agency for reporting under [§§ 303.700](#) through [303.702](#).

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE INDICATOR/MEASUREMENT

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data expressed as a percentage. OSEP assumes that the State's FFY 2023 data for this indicator is the State's baseline data unless the State provides an explanation for using other baseline data.

Data Source: The State must include findings from data collected through all components of the State's general supervision system that are used to identify noncompliance. This includes, but is not limited to, information collected through State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, and fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which noncompliance is identified by the State. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation. Include all findings of noncompliance regardless of the specific type and extent of noncompliance.

Targets: Targets must be 100%.

Report in Column A the total number of findings of noncompliance made in FFY 2022 (July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023) and report in Column B the number of those findings which were timely corrected, as soon as possible and in no case later than one year after the State's written notification of noncompliance.

Starting with the FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, States are required to report on the correction of noncompliance related to compliance indicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, and 8c) based on findings issued in FFY 2022. Under each compliance indicator, States report on the correction of noncompliance for that specific indicator. However, in this general supervision Indicator 12, States report on both those findings as well as any additional findings that the State issued related to that compliance indicator.

In the last row of this General Supervision Data Table, States may also provide additional information related to other findings of noncompliance that are not specific to the compliance indicators. This row would include reporting on all other findings of noncompliance that were not reported by the State under the compliance indicators listed below (e.g., Results indicators (including related requirements), Fiscal, Dispute Resolution, etc.). In future years (e.g., with the FFY 2026 SPP/APR), States may be required to further disaggregate findings by results indicators (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, and 11), fiscal and other areas.

Indicator 12 General Supervision Data Table

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 - 6/30/23)	Column B: # of written findings of noncompliance from (A) that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected not later than one year from identification)	Column C: # of written findings of noncompliance from (A) for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
<p>Indicator 1. Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Family Service Plans (IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)</p>			
	<p>*If the # of findings reported in Columns A, B, and/or C is different than the # of findings reported by the State under the correction of noncompliance section in Indicator 1, please provide the following:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 1 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements). [text box] 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Column B above, please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01² how the State verified that the EIS program/provider is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on <i>updated data</i>: [text box] 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Column B above, please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each <i>individual case</i> of noncompliance was corrected: [text box] 			

² On July 24, 2023, OSEP released OSEP QA 23-01, which supersedes previous guidance on the verification of correction of written findings of noncompliance as described in OSEP's Memorandum 09-02: Reporting on Correction of Noncompliance in the Annual Performance Report Required under Sections 616 and 642 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (Oct. 17, 2008) (OSEP Memo 09-02), among other previously issued guidance on the topic.

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 - 6/30/23)	Column B: # of written findings of noncompliance from (A) that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected not later than one year from identification)	Column C: # of written findings of noncompliance from (A) for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
<p>Indicator 7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom initial evaluation, initial assessment, and the initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.</p> <p>[20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442]</p>			
	<p>*If the # of findings reported in Columns A, B, and/or C is different than the # of findings reported by the State under the correction of noncompliance section in Indicator 7, please provide the following:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in the applicable indicator (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements). [text box] 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Column B above, please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on <i>updated data</i>: [text box] For Column B above, please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each <i>individual case</i> of noncompliance was corrected: [text box] 		

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 - 6/30/23)	Column B: # of written findings of noncompliance from (A) that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected not later than one year from identification)	Column C: # of written findings of noncompliance from (A) for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
<p>Indicator 8. The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:</p> <p>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;</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p>			
	<p>*If the # of findings reported in Columns A, B, and/or C is different than the # of findings reported by the State under the correction of noncompliance section in Indicator 8A, please provide the following:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in the applicable indicator (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements). [text box] 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Column B above, please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on <i>updated data</i>: [text box] 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Column B above, please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each <i>individual case</i> of noncompliance was corrected: [text box] 			

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 - 6/30/23)	Column B: # of written findings of noncompliance from (A) that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected not later than one year from identification)	Column C: # of written findings of noncompliance from (A) for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
<p>Indicator 8. The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:</p> <p>B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy) the SEA and 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 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p>			
<p>*If the # of findings reported in Columns A, B, and/or C is different than the # of findings reported by the State under the correction of noncompliance section in Indicator 8B, please provide the following:</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in the applicable indicator (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements). [text box] 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Column B above, please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on <i>updated data</i>: [text box] 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Column B above, please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, Describe how the State verified that each <i>individual case</i> of noncompliance was corrected: [text box] 			

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 - 6/30/23)	Column B: # of written findings of noncompliance from (A) that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected not later than one year from identification)	Column C: # of written findings of noncompliance from (A) for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
<p>Indicator 8. The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p>			
<p>*If the # of findings reported in Columns A, B, and/or C is different than the # of findings reported by the State under the correction of noncompliance section in Indicator 8C, please provide the following:</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in the applicable indicator (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements). [text box] 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Column B above, please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on <i>updated data</i>: [text box] 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Column B above, please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each <i>individual case</i> of noncompliance was corrected: [text box] 			

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 - 6/30/23)	Column B: # of written findings of noncompliance from (A) that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected not later than one year from identification)	Column C: # of written findings of noncompliance from (A) for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
<p><u>Optional for FFYs 2023, 2024, and 2025:</u></p> <p>Other Areas - All other findings: States may report here on all other findings of noncompliance that were not reported under the compliance indicators listed above (e.g., Results indicators (including related requirements), Fiscal, Dispute Resolution, etc.). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p>			
	<p>Explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any findings reported in this section: [text box]</p>		
	<p>For Column B above, please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the EIS program/provider is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on <i>updated data</i>: [text box]</p>		
<p>For Column B above, please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each <i>individual case</i> of noncompliance was corrected: [text box]</p>			
<p>Sum: Add the numbers within each of Columns A, B, and C</p>			
<p>Percent of findings of noncompliance verified as corrected within one year of identification = (Column B Sum divided by Column A Sum) times 100 This represents the State's FFY 2023 data for Indicator 12 and is the State's baseline for this Indicator.</p>	<p>(B / A) x 100 =</p>		
<p>Percent of findings of noncompliance not corrected or not verified as corrected within one year of identification = (Column C Sum divided by Column A Sum) times 100</p>	<p>(C / A) x 100 =</p>		

FFY 2023 INDICATOR 12 DATA - SUMMARY OF FINDINGS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED IN FFY 2022 CORRECTED IN FFY 2023 (CORRECTED WITHIN ONE YEAR FROM IDENTIFICATION OF THE NONCOMPLIANCE):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State identified during FFY 2022 (the period from July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023) (Sum of Column A on the Indicator C-12 Data Table)	
2. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of written notification to the EIS program/provider of the finding) (Sum of Column B on the Indicator C-12 Data Table)	
3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	

SUBSEQUENT CORRECTION: SUMMARY OF ALL OUTSTANDING FINDINGS OF NONCOMPLIANCE NOT TIMELY CORRECTED (CORRECTED MORE THAN ONE YEAR FROM IDENTIFICATION OF THE NONCOMPLIANCE):

4. Number of findings of noncompliance not timely corrected (same as the number in Column C from above)	
5. Number of findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	
6. Number of findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	

Subsequent correction: If the State did not ensure timely correction of previous findings of noncompliance, provide information on the nature of any continuing noncompliance and the actions that have been taken, or will be taken, to ensure the subsequent correction of the outstanding noncompliance, to address areas in need of improvement, and any sanctions or enforcement actions used, as necessary and consistent with IDEA's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules. [text box]

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1820-0578. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1,100 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain benefit under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. section 1400 et. seq.). If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate, suggestions for improving this individual collection, or if you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual form, application or survey, please contact Christine Pilgrim / Christine.Pilgrim@ed.gov directly.