

KY Part C

FFY2014 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Executive Summary:

The Kentucky Early Intervention System (KEIS) is comprised of fifteen (15) regional local lead agencies, Points of Entry (POE). The majority of POEs are funded through contracts with Local Health Departments, Commission for Children with Special Health Care Needs, and Comprehensive Mental Health Centers. One POE is jointly funded through a local hospital and a Comprehensive Mental Health Center. All service coordination is provided by POE staff. Early intervention providers are contracted by the State Lead Agency (SLA) to provide services within a specific catchment area. General Supervision is provided by staff at the SLA. Kentucky uses an online data management system known as the Technology-Assisted Observation and Teaming System (TOTS). TOTS provides an electronic early intervention record for each child referred to First Steps, along with financial and management data based on child data in the system. The Cabinet for Health and Family Services, Department for Public Health is the lead agency, designated by the Governor in 2004.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

General Supervision System:

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

General Supervision

Various methods are used to assess compliance with regulation and contract. Checklists that identify each regulatory item for the early intervention record allows for indication of what was reviewed—the online data management system, TOTS, and/or the hard copy file. Interview questions are tailored to the role being assessed—POE Manager, Service Coordinator, District Child Evaluation Specialist, Administrative Staff, or Early Intervention Services Provider. Other methods used to support General Supervision include time and effort studies, analysis of multiple reports (trend reports, ad hoc reports specific to an area of concern or question, faxed verification documents) and review of anecdotal information from parents and early intervention service providers.

Contracts with the POEs and early intervention providers require compliance with all applicable federal and state statutes and regulations. Contracts are enforced with noncompliance addressed by corrective action plans, technical assistance, and training. Failure to correct noncompliance in a timely manner results in sanctions that range from restricting services to financial penalties, and ultimately, contract termination.

The SLA has a variety of enforcement actions to use in conjunction with local determinations, lack of timely correction of noncompliance, or other circumstances that warrant SLA actions. Enforcement actions include, but are not limited to:

- o Required POE or Provider selected on-site technical assistance;
- o SLA prescribed on-site technical assistance;
- o On-site technical assistance with POE administration, including fiscal agency management;
- o Required increased frequency of technical assistance phone calls to POE Manager that

- addresses areas of concern and noncompliance;
- o Focused onsite monitoring on a specific area of noncompliance;
- o Development or revision of a professional development plan to include identifying and implementing profession development related to the areas of noncompliance;
- o POE and/or service provider required to complete record reviews at a frequency determined by the SLA and verified by the SLA staff;
- o POE linked to other districts or service providers demonstrating best practices in the identified area(s) of noncompliance for mentoring;
- o POE Manager and/or service providers required to collect and analyze data related to area(s) of noncompliance at a frequency determined by the SLA and reviewed with SLA staff;
- o Required meeting with POE Administration, District Early Intervention Council (DEIC) Chairperson, SLA staff and Part C Coordinator to discuss barriers to compliance, Corrective Action Plan strategies and additional avenues for technical assistance and support;
- o Withhold district POE payments, or if it is determined that one or more provider/providers are responsible for an area of noncompliance, withhold payment from the provider(s);
- o Recover funds; and
- o Terminate the district POE contract or, if it is determined that one or more providers are responsible for an area of noncompliance, terminate the provider contract(s).

Comprehensive Reviews (POE and Providers)

Comprehensive reviews are conducted on POEs and Early Intervention Providers periodically. The Comprehensive Review consists of an on-site review of a sampling of the hard copy early intervention records maintained by the POE. Staff are also interviewed using targeted questions addressing specific tasks. Early Intervention Provider's records are reviewed based upon a sampling of their caseload.

Each record reviewed on-site undergoes a desk audit of the electronic record in TOTS. This process includes review of the child and family assessments, IFSPs, service logs, transition (if applicable), and communication logs. Signed forms are matched to entries in TOTS to verify dates. A formal detailed report is sent to the POE or Early Intervention Provider, citing instances of noncompliance and requirements for corrective action.

Monthly POE Data Reports

POEs are required to submit monthly data reports for the State Performance Plan compliance indicators 1 (provision of timely services), 7 (Individualized Family Service Plan within 45 days), and 8C (timely transition conference). POE Managers must review all instances of missed timelines and verify the accuracy of the reason for delay. The data reports are then verified by SLA staff. Cases where there is a disagreement between the POE Manager and SLA staff are referred back to the POE Manager for additional review and clarification. Final resolution is determined by the SLA.

Desk Audits of the POEs and Early Intervention Providers

Kentucky SLA staff routinely conducts desk audits of three specific areas of service delivery to assess fidelity and quality:

- o Family Assessment fidelity checks—POE Managers conduct fidelity checks on the Family Assessments done by their staff. A representative sample of cases are reviewed using a checklist specifically designed for the *Routines-Based Interview*® process adopted by Kentucky. SLA staff, who are certified trainers in the *Routines-Based Interview*®, review the fidelity reports and provide technical assistance as needed.
- o Assessment and Progress Report Reviews—Assessment reports and progress reports are reviewed through a desk audit. Both reports are entered into TOTS by the provider and assessment reports are tied to payment. Manual review for payment approval includes verification that the report is complete with no errors such as missing scores, wrong child's name in report, etc. Assessment data entry required for child outcomes measurement is also

verified. Progress Reports are reviewed for use of data to support narrative description of progress. Both types of reports are checked for compliance to timelines for entry.

- o Provider Service Log Reviews—Service logs are reviewed periodically for:
 - § Delivery of appropriate early intervention services;
 - § Implementation of Primary Service Provider model;
 - § Connection of services to IFSP outcomes; and,
 - § Consistency with concerns/priorities identified in the Family Assessment.

Billing Audits of the POEs and Early Intervention Providers

Review of the billing records for a POE or Early Intervention Provider are conducted when there is a suspicion of billing irregularities. Claims are matched to the IFSP authorizations and service logs. Should billing irregularities be identified, the review is forwarded to the Office of the Inspector General for further investigation. The provider agency is suspended from new referrals while the investigation is pending. In the case of a POE, payment of submitted invoices are suspended (in part or in full) while the investigation is pending.

District Determinations

All State Performance Plan indicators (compliance and results) are assessed as part of the District Determination process. District Determinations are issued in June (within the timelines established by law) and posted on the website. Each indicator is assigned a point value based upon exceeding/meeting or not meeting the target for the indicator. The total point score is then compared to a scale that provides the cut-off score for each level of the determination (Meets Requirements, Needs Assistance, Needs Improvement, and Needs Substantial Improvement). Any POE that does not achieve “Meets Requirements” must participate in technical assistance. POEs that achieve a designation of Needs Improvement or Needs Substantial Improvement must implement a state-directed corrective action plan.

Corrective Action Plans (CAP)

The CAP is a plan that is implemented by the POE or early intervention provider. It describes a set of integrated strategies that address contributing factors impacting noncompliance and performance of SPP/APR indicators or other areas of noncompliance. CAP strategies are designed to ensure correction of noncompliance as soon as possible but no later than one year from the date of the SLA's written notification of the finding.

POE CAP

POE, in collaboration with district stakeholders, is responsible for developing a CAP following completion of the investigation of contributing factors (local contributing factor tool) of noncompliance. SLA staff supports the POE in investigating contributing factors and in developing the CAP. The CAP must address all areas of noncompliance identified by the state and is a plan of correction for the POE and its providers. The POE submits a final CAP to the SLA by August 15th when the CAP is associated with the SPP/APR. The SLA notifies the POE of approval of the CAP by August 31st and in collaboration with each POE, establishes benchmarks in the CAP for each indicator that has noncompliance. If a CAP is not approved by the SLA, SLA staff will work with the POE to revise the CAP and gain approval within 30 days of the written notification of disapproval. POE is responsible for implementing CAP strategies and reviewing data to ensure progress in accordance with established CAP benchmarks. SLA staff will provide support to the POE in implementing the CAP.

CAPs that involve contract obligations or related items are handled in a similar manner but approval date by the SLA is dependent upon the issue found to be noncompliant.

Early Intervention Service Provider CAP

Early Intervention Service Providers (Provider) may be responsible for developing a CAP following completion of the investigation of contributing factors (local contributing factor tool) of noncompliance. SLA staff supports the provider in the investigation of contributing factors and in developing the CAP. The CAP must address all areas of noncompliance identified by the state. The provider submits a final CAP to the SLA by the date designated by the SLA. The SLA notifies the POE of approval of the CAP no later than thirty (30) days from date of submission and in collaboration with the provider, establishes benchmarks in CAP for each noncompliance. If a CAP is not approved by the SLA, SLA staff will work with the Provider to revise the CAP and gain approval within 30 days of the written notification of disapproval. The Provider is responsible for implementing CAP strategies and reviewing data to ensure progress in accordance with established CAP benchmarks. SLA staff provides support to the provider in implementing the CAP.

CAPs that involve contract obligations or related items are handled in a similar manner but approval date by the SLA is dependent upon the issue found to be noncompliant.

State-Directed CAPs

There are instances where the POE or Provider has committed a noncompliance that has no variation in the actions required for correction. The SLA develops the CAP by identifying the strategies the POE or Provider must take for correction.

Dispute Resolution System

Kentucky adopted the Part C dispute resolution provisions of the Individual with Disabilities Education Act.

Complaint Investigations: Formal Complaints

A formal complaint is defined as a written, signed complaint. All formal complaints are investigated as appropriate within sixty (60) days of receipt of the complaint.

- o During the investigation process the Early Intervention Provider is suspended from receiving new referrals but is allowed to continue to provide ongoing services for the children currently on his or her caseload.
- o The investigation involves a desk audit of the TOTS records for other children on the provider's current caseload as well as interviews of other parents to determine if the complaint is a systemic issue for the Provider.
- o Once the investigation is completed the Provider is either released from the suspension with no finding of noncompliance or is released from the suspension with a finding of noncompliance.
- o When a finding of noncompliance is issued to the Provider, the Provider either develops a corrective action plan or is placed under a state directed corrective action plan.
- o The complainant is notified of the investigation findings.

Complaint Investigations: Informal Complaints

Informal complaints are defined as complaints that are not written but rather are provided to the SLA and/or POE by telephone or email. The issue is not related to a specific child or to systemic issues related to regulation but may involve topics such as late arrival for service provision, late response to phone calls, number of referrals another provider receives, etc. Informal complaints are tracked for monitoring of trends related to a particular service provider or service delivery area. Receipt of at least three informal complaints about an Early Intervention Provider is investigated as a formal complaint.

Mediation

Each POE ensures that parties may resolve disputes concerning the identification, evaluation, placement of the child or the provision of appropriate early intervention services through a mediation process. This process is available if a due process hearing is requested. The Department for Public Health has a mediation system that is voluntary and does not deny or delay a parent's right to a due process hearing to be

conducted at any time. Both parties in the dispute must agree to use mediation. Children continue to receive the early intervention services currently being provided during the interim of any proceeding involving a complaint. If the complaint involves the application for initial services, the child receives the services that are not in dispute.

Within five (5) working days after a request for mediation is made to the SLA using a Mediation/Due Process Request Form, a trained mediator is appointed. One of the parties may waive the mediation and, if waived, the parents are informed by the SLA within two (2) working days of this decision. Mediation is completed within thirty (30) working days of the receipt by the SLA of the request for mediation.

At any time during the mediation process, a request for a due process hearing may be initiated. If the parties resolve a dispute through the mediation process, the parties execute a legally binding agreement that is signed by both the parent and a representative of the SLA who has the authority to enter into an agreement. A copy of the legally binding agreement is then mailed by the mediator to each party within five (5) working days following the mediation conference. A copy shall be filed by the mediator with the SLA. Discussions that occur during the mediation process are confidential and cannot be used as evidence in any subsequent due process hearing or civil proceeding. The parties to the mediation process are required to sign a confidentiality pledge prior to the start of the mediation.

Due Process Hearings for Parents and Children

An administrative hearing is conducted within fifteen (15) days of receipt of a request for hearing by an impartial hearing officer appointed by the Secretary of the Cabinet. The hearing is conducted in accordance with the requirements of state law, KRS Chapter 13B.080. A recommended decision conforming in content to the requirements of KRS 13B.110 is forwarded to the family and the Cabinet within ten (10) days of the administrative hearing. A final decision on the recommendation by the administrative hearing officer shall be made no later than thirty (30) days by the Secretary of the Cabinet.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

Technical Assistance System:

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

The State Lead Agency (SLA) has dedicated staff for training and technical assistance that includes the Part C Assistant Coordinator, three technical assistance positions located at the SLA, and one part-time technical assistance position located in Bowling Green, KY (shared position with Kentucky Birth Surveillance Registry). SLA staff addresses implementation of early intervention practices in the provision of the technical assistance, emphasizing evidence-based practices.

Contracts with University of Kentucky and University of Louisville staffs provide technical assistance on assessment and evaluation practices for both Point of Entry staff and early intervention providers.

Additional training and technical assistance is provided by other SLA staff as needed and typically related to

general supervision. SLA staff assists districts in understanding and analyzing district data, developing and monitoring CAPs and self-assessments, and in providing ongoing training related to compliance. Indirect technical assistance is provided through newsletter articles and webinars highlighting specific evidenced-based practices.

Attachments			
File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	
No APR attachments found.			

Professional Development System:

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

On-going training is required for all service personnel in KEIS. This is established in the contract for Point of Entry staff and all Early Intervention Service Providers. Training must have prior approval by the State Lead Agency (SLA) for credit hours to meet contract requirements. Training sponsored by the SLA is provided through webinar, online modules and face-to-face. The SLA purchased the Adobe Connect system for webinar and online training purposes approximately three years ago. The system provides a learner tracking system so that the SLA can monitor compliance to required trainings. Initially, significant staff time was needed to learn the system and develop the core online training modules. Modules are added and/or revised when needed.

The SLA also contracts for the provision of specific training:

- University of Louisville provides training to POE Managers and District Child Evaluation Specialists (DCES).
- University of Kentucky provides training for approved assessment instruments (used for outcome measures) and operation of the online data entry portal.
- Wendell-Foster Campus for Developmental Disabilities hosts an online assistive technology community of practice.

SLA Training Initiatives

Early Identification of Autism: Beginning in 2011, the SLA launched an initiative to support early identification of Autism Spectrum Disorders. This ongoing initiative was an interagency approach with representatives of the Kentucky Department of Education and Department of Behavioral Health, Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities participating in training events. Initial training focused on screening. Participants received child find materials adapted from the Centers for Disease Control “Act Early” campaign and were trained on the administration of the *M-CHAT Revised* and the *Screening Tool for Autism in Toddlers (STAT)* screening instruments. Later trainings introduced the administration of *The Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule (ADOS)* to the District Child Evaluation Specialists. Reliability training is the follow-up on this specific instrument.

Working with Toddlers with Autism: An extensive course on autism was developed for early intervention service providers. This training involves multiple sessions that includes webinars, face-to-face sessions, and follow-up coaching/problem-solving sessions. Two Hanen Centre programs were provided for specific early intervention provider types: *Target Word*® was provided to speech and language pathologists who had completed the prerequisite course, *It Takes Two to Talk*®, and *Everyday Interactions for Early Intervention*® was provided to developmental interventionists and occupational therapists. Future planned trainings to support this initiative include a series of hybrid training (combination face-to-face and online) on Sensory Processing in Natural Contexts. Topics include:

- sensory processing assessment with differential diagnostic considerations;
- strengths-based practices overview;
- documentation of coaching and skill transfer using strengths-based language; and,
- imbedding interventions with natural context.

FFY14 Update: The live training on sensory processing was completed with the online module now in final steps of publication.

Family Assessment: The SLA also targeted the Family Assessment for significant improvement. The three training and technical assistance staff at the SLA obtained certification as trainers of *The Routine-Based Interview*® by Robin McWilliam. Dr. McWilliam was then contracted to train one service coordinator from each of the POEs; those who became certified trainers in this process are regional support to help build local capacity. All service coordinators are trained in *The Routine-Based Interview*® and periodic fidelity checks are conducted by both the POE Managers and the SLA certified trainers. Coaching is provided regularly to address issues uncovered in the fidelity checks and to keep service coordinators aware of the critical importance this evidence-based practice has in the development of IFSPs.

Improved Assessment Reports: The SLA convened a workgroup to identify needed revisions to the TOTS assessment report template that would drive strength-based assessment reports in 2012. Subsequently, guidance documents and examples of well-written reports have been disseminated. An online module for the Adobe training system is currently under development.

Training Collaboration with Other State Initiatives

Help Me Grow and HANDS Home Visiting: Collaborative training on the *Ages & Stages Questionnaire* screeners is conducted with First Steps, Help Me Grow, and HANDS home visiting staffs.

Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) Grant: First Steps is represented on the Training and Technical Assistance workgroup of the Kentucky Strengthening Families Initiative. This major activity for family engagement is one of the major activities cited in the Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge grant awarded to Kentucky and overseen by the Governor's Office of Early Childhood. At this point, training has begun with over fifteen different agencies and programs. First Steps also participates in the planning of the annual Ready Kids Conference, which addresses issues for the age span of birth to five.

Governor's Office of Early Childhood, Early Childhood Advisory Council (ECAC): First Steps is a participating program on the Professional Development workgroup of the Early Childhood Advisory Council (ECAC). Representatives of First Steps are part of the group who will review the Early Learning Standards online modules developed by KET public television. As the quality rating system for early childhood activities begin, opportunities for joint training and other collaborations will occur.

Governor's Advisory Council on Autism Spectrum Disorder: The Part C Coordinator is an appointed member

of this Council and sits on the Early Childhood Subcommittee. Opportunities for collaboration regarding training will be identified by this committee. Prior to the Council formation, First Steps assisted the ad hoc group with grant writing for funds to support early identification of very young children with Autism Spectrum Disorder.

Early Hearing Detection and Intervention (EDHI): The lead agency for EDHI, the Commission for Children with Special Health Care Needs (CCSHCN), and First Steps has worked together for approximately four (4) years to identify and treat infants with hearing loss. Through a grant, the CCSHCN has provided Otoacoustic Emissions (OAE) equipment to POEs and provides the necessary training for optimal use.

Kentucky Commission for Deaf and Hard of Hearing and Statewide Educational Resource Center on Deafness: A memorandum of agreement has been developed to support parent training (using the SKI-HI Curriculum) provided by the Statewide Resource Center on Deafness in conjunction with the Kentucky Commission for Deaf and Hard of Hearing. Regional trainings are planned for Fall, 2015.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part C results indicators

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

Input from stakeholders in Kentucky has been a continual process since the program was transferred from the Commission for Children with Special Health Care Needs to the Department for Public Health in July 2004. Stakeholders have included parents, Early Intervention Service Providers, State Lead Agency (SLA) staff, contracted staff, Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) members, Point of Entry (POE) staff (including Service Coordinators), Primary Level Evaluators, and Intensive Level Evaluators. All geographic and population density areas of the state have been represented.

The process of developing the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) includes gathering data, cleaning and verifying data, and writing of narrative portions of the APR. Specific input from stakeholders with interest or expertise in the indicator area (topic) assists as needed with the drafting of the APR. The stakeholder groups also recommend revisions to improvement activities after evaluating the status. Each year a formal presentation of the SPP/APR is provided to the ICC. Discussion of each Indicator is held with suggested revisions provided to the SLA. The ICC has certified the APR each year due to this collaborative process for development.

Annually, the SPP and APR are both posted on the First Steps website at: <http://chfs.ky.gov/dph/firstSteps/FirstSteps+Annual+Reports.htm> upon submission to the US Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs.

Each year the SPP and Annual Performance Report (APR) is presented to the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) for input on the document. Any revision to a target is first developed by a workgroup with knowledge and expertise concerning the Indicator. Then, the proposed targets are disseminated to the KEIS listserv (over 1300 interested parents, advocates, early intervention providers, university and college faculty, and representatives of various state and local agencies). The proposed targets are also posted on the KEIS website with informaton on how to submit feedback. Feedback is also sought from the ICC as well prior to the formal certifiication of the SPP/APR.

Dissemination of the SPP to the Public

The SPP is published on the First Steps website upon submission to OSEP. The web address is: <http://chfs.ky.gov/dph/firststeps.htm>. Interested parties without web access can contact the State Lead Agency for a copy. In addition, all of the public libraries in Kentucky have web access, so anyone in Kentucky could access the web and thus the report at the local public library. The same method is used for dissemination of the Annual Performance Report (APR). A yearly article in the KEIS newsletter is an "APR Results At-A-Glance".

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2012 performance of each EIS Program or Provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2012 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2012 APR in 2014, is available.

Kentucky's system is divided into fifteen (15) districts (POEs or Local Lead Agencies) which follow the boundaries of the state's Area Development Districts. Kentucky reports data by those POE districts, considering each district to be an 'early intervention program'. Determinations, based on the performance of the POE district on achievement of the SPP targets, is published on the KEIS website no later than 120 days from the date of SPP/APR submission to OSEP. These reports can be obtained on the website home page, under "District Data".

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 1: Timely provision of services

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		79.00%	80.00%	81.00%	74.70%	87.00%	91.00%	98.82%	99.61%	99.87%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
7122	7418	99.87%	100%	99.50%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner)	259
---	-----

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

- State monitoring
- State database

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

July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015

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

Every IFSP (initial, annual, six-month, and requested review IFSPs) is entered into TOTS, the online database management system. Planned services, the section of the IFSP that contains all services to be provided during the period of the IFSP, also serves as the authorization for each service. The date of the IFSP meeting is matched to the date of service delivery for the first payment claim and the number of days between date of the IFSP and date of service is calculated. A report (Timely Services) is available for the time period

designated that lists every initial date of service for all IFSPs during the reporting period. Timely Services reports are reviewed monthly at the Point of Entry, then verified by the State Lead Agency staff. As part of the preparation of the State Performance Plan report, a different State Lead Agency staff person reviews and verifies the state report. The results are then compared with the monthly reports submitted as part of general supervision for consistency.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Thirty-seven (37) initial services were delivered beyond 30 days of the IFSP meeting. The range in days late was from one (1) to five (5) days. Ten (10) cases had services delivered by day 31 (one day late) and eleven (11) cases were two days late (day 32). Fourteen cases were no more late than four days (seven delivered on each day 33 and 34). The two remaining late initial services were delivered on day 35.

Four (4) children received late initial services due to the a change in foster homes. Notification from the child protection worker to the service coordinator and/or providers delayed the timely delivery of service. The remaining late cases were due to providers scheduling the first visit after the thirty-day timeline or scheduling late within the thirty-day timeline with no flexibility to reschedule timely when the provider cancelled due to illness or road conditions.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	3	0	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The SLA verified correction of findings by implementing the following steps:

1. Reviewed child's record on the TOTS system focusing on date of the IFSP and the date of initial service delivery according to service logs entered by the provider in TOTS. Billing claims were also reviewed to match service log. Each finding of noncompliance was checked to ensure that services were delivered, even when later than 30 days from the IFSP date.
2. Reviewed data to determine if the reason for delay was a family-driven reason, service provider-driven reason or if the data were a result of a computer programming error.
3. Providers who were found to have delayed timely services were notified that the delay was unacceptable. The notice informed the provider that additional instances of noncompliance would result in suspension of their contract to provide early intervention services.
4. Monthly desk audits of the POE performance on this indicator were conducted to ensure that the applicable regulations were implemented properly.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The SLA verified correction of individual child findings by implementing a similar process as described to verify correction by the POE (local lead agency):

1. Reviewed each child's record with a finding of non-compliance on the TOTS system focusing on date of the IFSP and the date of initial service delivery according to service logs entered by the provider in TOTS. Billing claims were also reviewed to match service log. Each finding of noncompliance was checked to ensure that services were delivered, even when later than 30 days from the IFSP date.
2. Reviewed data to determine if the reason for delay was a family-driven reason, service provider-driven reason or if the data were a result of a computer programming error.
3. Providers who were found to have delayed timely services were notified that the delay was unacceptable. The notice informed the provider that additional instances of noncompliance would result in suspension of their contract to provide early intervention services.
4. Quarterly desk audits of the provider's performance on this indicator were conducted to ensure that the applicable regulations were implemented properly.

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			98.70%	98.70%	98.70%	98.70%	98.70%	98.70%	98.70%	98.70%
Data		98.70%	99.30%	99.50%	99.50%	99.40%	99.50%	99.56%	99.56%	99.18%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	98.70%	98.70%	98.70%	98.70%	98.70%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	4,408	
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	4,423	

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
4,408	4,423	99.18%	98.70%	99.66%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Kentucky continues to provide a very high percentage of services in the natural environment. The fifteen (15) children who received services in clinic settings did so due to no provider available who would travel to the

child's home.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

Does your State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? No

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A1	2008	Target ≥						62.00%	72.00%	71.50%	80.00%	86.00%
		Data					70.10%	66.80%	92.00%	91.00%	90.00%	86.37%
A2	2008	Target ≥						31.00%	60.00%	61.00%	62.50%	68.98%
		Data					48.10%	62.40%	55.00%	52.00%	73.00%	68.98%
B1	2008	Target ≥						50.00%	63.00%	76.00%	85.00%	90.66%
		Data					61.80%	67.70%	95.00%	95.00%	93.00%	90.66%
B2	2008	Target ≥						26.00%	55.00%	56.00%	57.50%	71.54%
		Data					28.80%	57.40%	48.00%	48.00%	75.00%	71.54%
C1	2008	Target ≥						50.00%	62.00%	76.00%	80.00%	85.77%
		Data					57.30%	67.20%	90.00%	90.00%	88.00%	85.77%
C2	2008	Target ≥						26.00%	52.00%	53.00%	54.50%	53.80%
		Data					29.10%	56.70%	30.00%	29.00%	58.00%	53.80%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	86.01%	86.02%	86.03%	86.04%	86.05%
Target A2 ≥	68.98%	68.99%	69.00%	69.00%	69.00%
Target B1 ≥	90.66%	90.67%	90.68%	90.69%	90.70%
Target B2 ≥	71.54%	71.55%	71.55%	71.55%	71.55%
Target C1 ≥	85.77%	85.78%	85.79%	85.80%	85.80%
Target C2 ≥	53.80%	53.81%	53.82%	53.83%	53.84%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

In addition to the stakeholder process described in the introduction, Kentucky monitors child outcome data through a system that is based on the *Kentucky Early Childhood Standards* (KDE, 2002; Revised 2012). This system was adopted by Part C in 2006-2007 and has been used since that time for Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) child outcome and summary statement reporting. The *Kentucky Early Childhood Standards* span the age range of birth to five for all children.

The University of Kentucky (UK) houses the Kentucky Early Childhood Data System (KEDS). KEDS is a web-based platform for gathering data from multiple providers for progress monitoring on the *Kentucky Early Childhood Standards* (KDE, 2002; Revised 2012) and OSEP child outcome and summary statements. Demographic data for each child were gathered through the Technology-Assisted Observation and Teaming Support System (TOTS), downloaded to KEDS, and verified by providers across the state. Considerable training and technical assistance for Early Intervention Service Providers, Part C state staff, and POE administrators has been provided to help ensure accuracy of data. Assessment data were entered in KEDS online by a designated IFSP team member, the Primary Service Provider. Since October 2010, KEDS online included a verification step to ensure that all *initial* assessments were complete in KEDS prior to payment to providers for the assessment. As of September 2011, all *annual* assessments also were required to be entered in KEDS prior to payment. These steps significantly increased the number of complete assessments in KEDS with which to inform data analyses.

Data analysis for OSEP reporting is based on two levels of detailed crosswalks. First, specific items on each approved assessment instrument were aligned to the *Kentucky Early Childhood Standards* (KDE, 2002) and benchmarks by the publishers of the approved assessment instruments. These alignments were reviewed, revised, and approved by state early childhood staff at both the SLA and Kentucky Department of Education. Then, each instrument crosswalk was reviewed by an expert panel (including assessment and child development expert representatives) to ensure coverage of the developmental continuum as well as alignment with Kentucky standards and benchmarks. The expert panel mapped individual items to benchmarks, and then age-anchored all items.

Each year, a workgroup group reviews Indicator 3 data and compares it to previous years' data as well as any national data available from the Early Childhood Outcomes Center. Due to the growth in the data pool and shifts attributed to that growth, targets are reviewed. The workgroup conducts a thorough study of the targets, current performance results, and past performance and targets to determine if the targets are appropriate. A set of revised targets are then presented to the larger stakeholder group who reviews the SPP/APR for input.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	2683.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	103.00	3.84%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	157.00	5.85%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	674.00	25.12%

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	886.00	33.02%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	863.00	32.17%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	1560.00	1820.00	86.37%	86.01%	85.71%
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	1749.00	2683.00	68.98%	68.98%	65.19%

Explanation of A2 Slippage

See attached additional information

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	52.00	1.94%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	102.00	3.80%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	692.00	25.79%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	943.00	35.15%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	894.00	33.32%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	1635.00	1789.00	90.66%	90.66%	91.39%
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	1837.00	2683.00	71.54%	71.54%	68.47%

Explanation of B2 Slippage

See additional information attached

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	76.00	2.83%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	312.00	11.63%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	984.00	36.68%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1041.00	38.80%

FFY 2014 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	270.00	10.06%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	2025.00	2413.00	85.77%	85.77%	83.92%
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	1311.00	2683.00	53.80%	53.80%	48.86%

Explanation of C1 Slippage

See attached additional information

Explanation of C2 Slippage

See attached additional information

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? No
 Provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” and list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

See attached document for explanation of slippage and further analysis of results.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2007	Target ≥					84.20%	85.20%	86.20%	86.80%	87.00%	99.45%
		Data			82.20%	83.20%	86.48%	94.10%	97.81%	97.80%	95.99%	99.45%
B	2007	Target ≥					75.30%	76.30%	77.30%	80.00%	80.00%	99.52%
		Data			73.30%	74.30%	92.01%	93.10%	98.22%	97.80%	96.95%	99.52%
C	2007	Target ≥					90.10%	90.60%	91.10%	91.50%	91.80%	99.03%
		Data			89.60%	89.60%	92.68%	92.10%	96.53%	96.76%	97.07%	99.03%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	99.45%	99.45%	99.45%	99.45%	99.45%
Target B ≥	99.52%	99.52%	99.52%	99.52%	99.52%
Target C ≥	99.03%	99.03%	99.03%	99.03%	99.03%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent families participating in Part C	1323.00
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	1320.00
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	1323.00
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	1319.00
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	1323.00
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	1318.00
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	1323.00

	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	99.45%	99.45%	99.77%
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	99.52%	99.52%	99.70%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	99.03%	99.03%	99.62%

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

Prior to conducting the family survey, Service Coordinators were encouraged to obtain email addresses for families on their caseload and to enter them into Kentucky's data management system (TOTS). The TOTS system was updated so that only an email format may be entered into this text field. Point of Entry (POE) managers were informed when the surveys were distributed so they are able to notify staff. POE staff were encouraged to inform parents that they may receive a family survey and should explain to families the importance of their feedback. Last year a comment box was added to both the online and paper versions of the family survey. The electronic version of the survey is sent out initially with an email that explains the family survey and includes a link for the parent to access ECO Family Outcomes survey. The email also includes the contact information for the parent consultant in case the family may have any questions or concerns that need to be addressed. This email is sent in both English and Spanish to all families electronically. The data for families that complete the online survey is saved directly into TOTS, the online data management system. Through TOTS the State Lead Agency is able to resend the surveys by email on a weekly basis to those families who have not responded to the electronic survey in an effort to encourage participation. The electronic version of the Family Survey is open for approximately one month. For FFY 2014, the number of online surveys completed was 537. This was an increase of 238 from FFY 2013. Once the electronic due date for submission has passed, TOTS is used to generate the mailing list for the families who did not respond to the survey electronically or who did not have email addresses listed in the TOTS system.

Section B, which is used for APR reporting, focuses on the three helpfulness indicators required for OSEP reporting and contains seventeen items. Section B uses a 5-point scale and assesses the helpfulness of early intervention, ranging from 1= Not at all helpful, 2= A little helpful, 3= Somewhat helpful, 4= Very helpful, 5= Extremely helpful. For the fifth year, an online version of the survey was made available to families with email addresses. Families who did not have an email address on file were sent a hard copy survey through the mail. A list of families across the state from the fifteen (15) POEs, whose child had participated in First Steps within 120-day period, was generated from TOTS. This method of surveying was approved by the state's OSEP project officer in FFY 2010.

The paper surveys are printed in English and in Spanish. The survey was accompanied by a letter from the First Steps Parent Consultant explaining the survey, how the data is used, and the deadline date for submission. Families are given approximately one month to respond to the hard copy survey as well. The paper surveys are sent with a postage paid envelope addressed to the State Lead Agency. As the surveys arrived to the State Lead Agency, staff was responsible for data entry into the TOTS data system. The State Lead Agency administered both the distribution of the family survey and data entry. This ensured consistent data administration and survey management. When surveys were returned undeliverable, but with a forwarding address, surveys were re-sent.

All regions of the state are represented in the survey results. Analysis is done to determine the representativeness of the distributed surveys in the areas of race and gender based on the July 1, 2014 Estimates of Kentucky Census Data (Birth to 4).

Total number of Family Outcomes surveys disseminated: 4620

Total number of returned surveys: Total: 1425 (888 by mail and 537 online). This number represents the total number of surveys that were returned to the State Lead Agency (SLA). This total includes incomplete surveys that were submitted.

The total number of respondent families participating in Part C that submitted complete surveys is 1323.

To calculate the percentages, the total number of positive responses for each statement was divided by the total number of responses (1323). The resulting number was then multiplied by 100.

A random sample of surveys entered into the database by SLA staff was reviewed for entry accuracy. No such review of the accuracy of parent entered data is possible. Family survey results are consistent with previous survey results which leads the SLA to accept the data as valid and reliable.

The survey distribution was consistent with the July 1, 2014 Estimates of Kentucky Census Data (Birth to 4) for race and ethnicity although the race/ethnicity groups are not aligned by the same groupings as the 619 race/ethnicity groupings.

Please see the attachment for more detail.

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No



Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State



No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

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

In FFY 2008, Kentucky changed the survey used for collecting data on Indicator 4. Use of Section B of the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Family Survey was adopted after a thorough discussion by stakeholders held December 15, 2007 based on the poor response rate using the NCSEAM Parent survey. At that time, all families with children with IFSPs were surveyed and the thought was that a single page format would increase the likelihood of completion of the survey.

In FFY 2010, the state altered the method of dissemination of the Family Survey from a statewide mailing to all children who were referred to First Steps to instituting sampling. A list was generated from TOTS (First Steps' data management system) from all fifteen Point of Entry offices statewide of families whose child had participated in First Steps within a 120-day period. The changes in the population surveyed were approved by the state's OSEP project officer in FFY 2010.

As a cost saving measure an online version of the survey was also made available to families with email addresses. From the sampling, all families that had an email address were sent an email explaining the family survey and the importance of their feedback. The email was sent in both English and Spanish and included the contact information for the parent consultant and a link to complete the online survey. Once the deadline for the online surveys had concluded, a list of the remaining names and addresses of the First Steps program participants (census) was generated by TOTS. Only families who did not respond to the online survey were sent a hard copy survey through the mail. The hard copy of the survey was printed in English and Spanish and was accompanied with a memo explaining the family survey and a postage paid addressed envelope.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For the first time in Kentucky, Section A of the ECO Family Outcomes Survey was used in conjunction with Section B. Section A was completed in an effort to gain baseline data for Indicator 11, the State Systemic

Improvement Plan (SSIP). Section A focuses on the ways the family supports their child's needs related to five outcome statements: Understanding their child's strengths, needs and abilities; Knowing their rights and advocating for their child; Helping their child develop and learn; Having support systems; and Accessing the community. Section A contains twenty-four items. The family is asked to rank which option best describes their family right now on a 5-point scale ranging from 1= Not at all, 2= A little, 3= Somewhat, 4= Almost, 5= Completely.

The data collected for Section A of the ECO Family Outcomes Survey will not be discussed in this section of the APR. Analysis of the baseline data collected from Section A will be included in the SSIP.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			0.56%	0.66%	0.76%	0.86%	0.71%	0.71%	0.71%	0.49%
Data		0.49%	0.60%	0.65%	0.74%	0.68%	0.65%	0.52%	0.55%	0.49%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	0.51%	0.52%	0.52%	0.52%	0.52%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	326	null
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013	4/3/2014	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	55,075	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
326	55,075	0.49%	0.51%	0.59%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			2.40%	2.45%	2.50%	2.55%	2.60%	2.65%	2.70%	2.53%
Data		2.17%	2.26%	2.54%	2.90%	2.94%	2.76%	2.75%	2.67%	2.53%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	2.54%	2.55%	2.55%	2.55%	2.55%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	4,423	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013	7/2/2015	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	165,913	

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
4,423	165,913	2.53%	2.54%	2.67%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		61.00%	92.50%	96.00%	97.00%	98.50%	99.42%	98.92%	98.16%	98.79%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
2,117	2,672	98.79%	100%	98.80%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline)	523
--	-----

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

- State monitoring
- State database

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

July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015

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

Every referral of a child is entered into the online database management system known as TOTS. A unique identifier is assigned to the case. The system is designed to match the date of the initial IFSP with the date of referral and calculates the forty-five day time-line. A report, Single Timeline Report, was generated for the date range indicated above (July 1, 2014-June 30, 2015) that includes all children who had an initial IFSP

developed during the time period. POE Managers are required to verify the reason the initial IFSP is late each month. State Lead Agency staff review these monthly reports to verify the reason for late initial IFSPs. In preparation for submitting the Annual Performance Report, a different State Lead Agency staff person reviews the statewide report to verify late initial IFSPs. This is then compared to the monthly POE reports for consistency.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

A total of thirty-two (32) initial IFSPs were developed past the forty-five (45) day timeline. Each case was reviewed to verify that an IFSP was developed, although late. The range in days late was one (1) to forty (40). Eleven (11) of those cases were late because the initial evaluators could not schedule the activity early enough within the 45 day timeline to meet the timeline. One (1) case was late because the appropriate discipline to conduct the initial evaluation was not available due to provider shortage and additional time was required to obtain the service. Fourteen (14) cases were the result of early intervention providers unable to meet for an IFSP within the timeline. Four (4) of those cases were due to inclement weather and the initial scheduled meeting was to occur on day 44 of the 45-day timeline. Included in that group was one (1) case where the initial IFSP was also the transition IFSP and the Local Education Agency representative was unable to meet until after the timeline. Six (6) cases were late because the service coordinator did not schedule the IFSP meeting until after the forty-five (45) day timeline. Reasons for this were unclear although a few were attributable to new service coordinators.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	3	0	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

SLA staff verified the correction of findings by implementing the following steps:

1. Reviewed child's record in TOTS focusing on date of referral and the date of the initial IFSP. Each child's record that was found in noncompliance was checked to ensure that the initial IFSP was held and finalized although later than forty-five (45) days from the referral date.
2. Checked data to determine if the reason for delay was a family-driven reason, an administrative-driven reason or if the data was a result of a computer programming error.
3. Once verified that the delay was due to an administrative-driven reason, the SLA then sent notices of performance to the POE indicating that the delay was unacceptable. The notice informed the POE that continued noncompliance would result in sanctions to their contract.
4. The SLA verified continued correction of all new IFSPs by reviewing monthly reports available through TOTS and reviewing all child records that did not meet the timeline. Subsequent data were reviewed to

verify that the POE was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

SLA staff verified the correction of findings by implementing the following steps:

1. Reviewed child's record in TOTS focusing on date of referral and the date of the initial IFSP. Each child's record that was found in noncompliance was checked to ensure that the initial IFSP was held and finalized although later than forty-five (45) days from the referral date.
2. Checked data to determine if the reason for delay was a family-driven reason, an administrative-driven reason or if the data was a result of a computer programming error.
3. Once verified that the delay was due to an administrative-driven reason, the SLA then sent notices of performance to the POE indicating that the delay was unacceptable. The notice informed the POE that continued noncompliance would result in sanctions to their contract.
4. The SLA verified continued correction of all new IFSPs by reviewing monthly reports available through TOTS and reviewing all child records that did not meet the timeline. Subsequent data were reviewed to verify that the POE was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data			74.50%	89.00%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

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

- Yes
- No

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
4,196	4,196	100%	100%	100%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services)	0
---	---

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

- State monitoring



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

July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015

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

TOTS, the online database management system, serves as the electronic early intervention record. The IFSP section of TOTS requires a transition outcome in order to save the IFSP. Service Coordinators and early intervention providers are trained to include at least one outcome that addresses the appropriate transition that the child and family will deal with over the next six months. For children under the age of two (2), transition outcomes may address life events such as moving from hospitalizations to home, moving from non-ambulatory stages of development to walking, changes in home environment, etc. For IFSPs that address children older than two (2), the outcome focuses on exiting Part C services. The IFSP must contain steps and services to appropriately address the transition outcome listed in the IFSP. All IFSPs have transition steps and services that support the identified transition outcome, no matter the age of the child.

The transition outcome is included in the checklist for program review as an essential element for compliance with IFSP development. Further, transition outcomes are part of the results of the family assessment and are included in the fidelity reviews of family assessments.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		100%	93.90%	92.80%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

- Yes
- No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
3,603	4,196	100%	100%	100%

Number of parents who opted out (this number will be subtracted from the number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B when calculating the FFY 2014 Data)	593
---	-----

Describe the method used to collect these data

Kentucky designates all children enrolled in Part C as potentially eligible for Part B services due to the restrictiveness of the

Part C eligibility. A list of all children potentially eligible for Part B services and whose parent has not opted-out of Local Education Agency (LEA) notification is generated on a quarterly basis by Part C. The list originates from the birthdates for children with active records in TOTS. This list is disaggregated by school district and forwarded to the LEA. The list is also sent to the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE). Service Coordinators are required to verify that the LEA received the notification as part of the transition process. The total unduplicated number of notifications to the LEAs and KDE is then compared to original list to ensure no child was dropped between the lists.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? Yes

Is the policy on file with the Department? Yes

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

- State monitoring
- State database

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

July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015

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

Every child's record in TOTS includes a Transition page. All key elements of the requirements for transition from Part C to Part B are required elements on that screen. An electronic file exchange process to the State Education Agency (SEA) was developed as part of a State Improvement Grant several years ago. There is a data-sharing agreement between Part C and the SEA to facilitate transition. The system is designed to default to parent agreement for transition activities; parents have the option to refuse notification of the LEA and KDE. Parents that choose this option must give written indication of their desire to opt-out and the Service Coordinator must unmark the item on the transition screen to indicate that parent does not agree to the transition activities.

The ongoing collaborative relationship between the agencies has resulted in consistently high rates of local coordination between LEAs and POEs. Families benefit from the positive relationships by participating in a smooth and effective transition process.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		90.00%	78.00%	75.84%	89.80%	93.20%	99.40%	99.63%	99.46%	99.83%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Explanation of Alternate Data

The number of children potentially eligible for Part B and who were eligible for a transition conference is 575 less than the number reported in 8B due to the number of children who exited without having a transition conference. Formal transition meetings were not held for all children who had met goals although some of the children who met goals had a transition conference to discuss other services. Most of the children who moved had documentation in their records that the service coordinator had contacted the receiving program (with written consent of the parents) to arrange the sending of assessments and IFSP despite moving before the transition meeting was scheduled to occur. Documentation indicated that many families who withdrew from services with no prior notification to the service coordinator were contacted by the service coordinators but refused further service, typically due to other family situations. No transition meeting was held for the children who died during the reporting year.

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services



Yes



No

FFY 2014 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
3,012	3,621	99.83%	100%	99.47%

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference (this number will be subtracted from the number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B when calculating the FFY 2014 Data)	593
Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B)	0

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

- State monitoring
- State database

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

July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015

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

The online data management system, TOTS, includes a listing of children for each service coordinator and POE Manager of all children on the service coordinator's caseload with an upcoming transition period. The transition screen in TOTS includes a banner that clearly provides the window of time for the timely transition conference. Further, POE Managers monitor the timeliness of transition conferences monthly and address any administrative or provider issue with the service coordinator that resulted in an untimely transition conference. This monthly monitoring is verified by State Lead Agency staff.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Sixteen (16) transition conferences were held late. Five (5) were late because the early intervention provider could not attend the meeting within the timeline and the Service Coordinators waited for their availability. One conference was late because the Local Education Agency representative was not available on a date within the timeline. Ten (10) of the untimely conferences were not held because the previous contractor did not ensure that all staff continue to fulfill the job duties for the entire period before the end of the contract. These files had no documentation of a reason for not being held. Several of the families were contacted by the staff of the new contractor to ascertain status of the child and offer assistance to the family however, this was after the ninety day timeline.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The SLA verified correction of findings by implementing the following steps:

- 1) Reviewed child’s record on the TOTS system focusing on timely transition date range. This date range is automatically calculated by the TOTS system based on the child’s date of birth. Each child’s record that was found in noncompliance was checked to ensure that the transition conference was held between age two (2) years, three (3) months and up to ninety (90) days before the child’s third birthday.
- 2) If there was an untimely transition meeting, the data were reviewed to determine if the reason for delay was a family-driven reason, an administrative-driven reason, or a computer programming error.
- 3) Once confirmed that the delay was due to an administrative-driven reason, two actions occurred. One, SLA verified that a transition meeting was held (although late). Secondly, the SLA sent notices of performance to the POE indicating that the delay was unacceptable. The notice informed the POE that continued noncompliance would result in sanctions to their contract.
- 4) The SLA verified continued correction by reviewing monthly reports available through TOTS and reviewing all child records that did not meet the timeline. Subsequent data were reviewed to verify that the POE was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The SLA verified correction of findings by implementing the following steps:

- 1) Reviewed child’s record on the TOTS system focusing on timely transition date range. This date range is automatically calculated by the TOTS system based on the child’s date of birth. Each child’s record that was found in noncompliance was checked to ensure that the transition conference was held between age two (2) years, three (3) months and up to ninety (90) days before the child’s third birthday.
- 2) If there was an untimely transition meeting, the data were reviewed to determine if the reason for delay was a family-driven reason, an administrative-driven reason, or a computer programming error.
- 3) Once confirmed that the delay was due to an administrative-driven reason, two actions occurred. One, SLA verified that a transition meeting was held (although late). Secondly, the SLA sent notices of performance to the POE indicating that the delay was unacceptable. The notice informed the POE that continued noncompliance would result in sanctions to their contract.
- 4) The SLA verified continued correction by reviewing monthly reports available through TOTS and reviewing all child records that did not meet the timeline. Subsequent data were reviewed to verify that the POE was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data:

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥					

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	NA	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	NA	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
NA	NA			NA

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 10: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Data			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

Since KY has not had a request for mediation or due process, targets were not set. This was a misunderstanding of the instructions from OSEP.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1 Mediations held	n	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	0	0		80.00%	

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014
Target		99.03%
Data	99.03%	

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	99.05%	99.10%	99.25%	99.50%

Key:

Description of Measure

Please see attached report.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Overview

Data Analysis

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

Please see attached report.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

FFY 2014 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in EIS programs and/or EIS providers to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and other early learning initiatives, such as Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge and the Home Visiting program and describe the extent that these new initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

Please see attached report.

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

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

Statement

Please see attached report.

Description

Please see attached report.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

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

Please see attached report.

Theory of Action

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

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

Please see attached report.

Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

Please see attached report

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

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Please see attached report

Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Please see attached report

Technical Assistance and Support

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

Please see attached report

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

This indicator is not applicable.