

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:
Part C**

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

**For reporting on
FFY18**

Kentucky



PART C DUE February 3, 2020

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and to ensure that the Lead Agency (LA) meets the requirements of Part C of the IDEA. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

The Department for Public Health is the administrative lead agency within the Cabinet for Health and Family Services (CHFS) for the Kentucky Early Intervention System. The system is comprised of fifteen (15) regional lead agencies, known as Points of Entry (POE). Contracts with Local Health Departments and Community Mental Health Centers fund the majority of POEs. One POE operates jointly through a Community Mental Health Center and private hospital. The Office for Children with Special Health Care Needs (OCSHCN), a state agency, operates one POE. POEs are responsible for all referrals, initial evaluations and assessments, eligibility determination, service coordination, and child find activities. Over 1000 service providers, representing a variety of professional disciplines, provide early intervention services through contracts with the Department for Public Health. Kentucky uses an online-integrated data management system known as the Technology-assisted Observation and Teaming Support system (TOTS). TOTS provides an electronic early intervention record for each child referred to the early intervention system integrated that includes financial and management data.

The FFY18 report depicts continued strong results for children and families. High results were evident in Indicator 2, Services in the Natural Environment. The Kentuckiana Point of Entry experienced significant improvement in performance of Indicators 1 and 7. Transition continued to be a strong indicator for Part C in Kentucky as local districts and POEs work well together to meet the requirements for both Part B and Part C.

The trend of significant increases in referrals and eligible children continued in FFY18. Referral to the development of the initial Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) occurred on average in thirty (30) days. Early intervention providers delivered initial IFSP services in a timely manner 97% of the time. The average number of days for initial delivery of early intervention services was seventeen (17) days after the IFSP meeting.

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.

Various methods assess compliance. Checklists that identify each regulatory item for the early intervention record allows for indicating data source reviewed—the online data management system, TOTS, and/or the hard copy file. Specific role interviews supplement the file review process. 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, etc.) 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. Untimely correction of noncompliance results in sanctions including restricting services, financial penalties, and ultimately, contract termination.

The State Lead Agency (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:

- Increased frequency of technical assistance phone calls to POE Manager that addresses areas of concern and noncompliance;
- Focused onsite monitoring on a specific area of noncompliance;
- Development or revision of a professional development plan related to the areas of noncompliance;
- Completion of record reviews at a frequency determined by the SLA and verified by the SLA staff;
- Linkage with other POE districts or service providers lined with other early intervention services providers demonstrating best practices in the identified area(s) of noncompliance for mentoring;
- Collection and analysis of data related to area(s) of noncompliance at a frequency determined by the SLA and reviewed with SLA staff;
- Discussions with local stakeholders to identify barriers to compliance, Corrective Action Plan strategies and additional avenues for technical assistance and support;
- Withholding of POE payment, or if it is determined that one or more provider/providers are responsible for an area of noncompliance, withholding of payment from the provider agency;
- Recovery of funds; and,
- Termination of the district POE contract or, if it is determined that one or more providers are responsible for an area of noncompliance, termination the agency contract(s).

Methods to assess compliance include: Comprehensive Reviews (POE and Providers), monthly POE Data Reports, and desk audits of the POEs and early intervention providers. Onsite verification visits may occur, depending upon the issues discovered by the desk audits and resources of the SLA.

Billing Audits of the POEs and Early Intervention Providers

The lead agency conducts quarterly reviews of billing records for a POE and/or an Early Intervention Provider. In addition to these regular reviews, an ad hoc review of the billing records for a POE or Early Intervention Provider are conducted when there is a suspicion or report 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 part of the District Determination process. District issuance of Determinations occurs in June (within the timelines established by law) and posted on the Department for Public Health/First Steps website. Each indicator has a point value based upon exceeding, meeting, or not meeting the target for the indicator. Comparison of the total point score to cut-off scores for each level of the determination (Meets Requirements, Needs Assistance, Needs Improvement, and Needs Substantial Improvement) follows. 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 plan of correction.

Corrective Action Plans

The Corrective Action Plan (CAP) is a plan implemented by the POE or Early Intervention Provider that describes a set of integrated strategies targeting

the SPP/APR performance or areas of noncompliance. CAP strategies 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.

State-Directed Corrective Action Plans

The SLA issues a State-Directed CAP when a previously submitted CAP failed to result in full correction of the issue(s) found noncompliant. The SLA identifies the strategies the POE or Provider must take for correction, including the date for full compliance.

Dispute Resolution System

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

Complaint Investigations: Formal Complaints

A formal complaint is a written, signed complaint. Completion of investigations of formal complaints is no more than sixty (60) calendar days of receipt of the complaint. During the investigation, 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. 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. Once the investigation is completed, release of the suspension occurs. When a finding of noncompliance is issued to the provider, the provider either develops a CAP or is placed under a State-Directed CAP. The complainant receives notification of the findings of the investigation.

Complaint Investigations: Informal Complaints

Informal complaints are defined as concerns provided to the SLA and/or POE by telephone or email. There is no filing of a formal, written complaint. 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 monitored for trends related to a particular service provider or service delivery area. Receipt of at least three (3) informal complaints about an Early Intervention Provider triggers an investigation 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 even if a due process hearing is not requested. The Department for Public Health has a voluntary mediation system and does not deny or delay a parent's right to a due process hearing.

Due Process Hearings for Parents and Children

An impartial hearing officer appointed by the Secretary of the Cabinet conducts an administrative hearing within fifteen (15) calendar days of receipt of a request for hearing. The hearing meets 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) calendar days of the administrative hearing. The Secretary of the Cabinet shall make a final decision on the recommendation by the administrative hearing officer no later than thirty (30) days.

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 SLA has dedicated staff for training and technical assistance including the Part C Assistant Coordinator, three (3) full-time technical assistance positions and one (1) part-time technical assistance position (shared position with Kentucky Birth Surveillance Registry). Other SLA staff as needed and typically related to general supervision provide technical assistance. 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.

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 provide technical assistance on assessment and evaluation practices for both POE staff and Early Intervention Providers.

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 personnel as one of the contract obligations. The SLA provides specific mandatory early intervention training modules. Delivery of SLA sponsored training happens through webinar, online modules and face-to-face sessions. The SLA uses a Learning Management System (LMS), Adobe Connect, for webinar and online training purposes. The system provides a learner tracking system so that the SLA can monitor compliance to required trainings. The addition or revision of modules occurs when needed. Newly developed during FFY18 were two modules: Child Outcomes and Assessment and Billing in First Steps.

The SLA also contracts for the provision of specific training:

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

During FFY18, work continued on the development of training materials identified in Indicator 11, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

Previously developed modules have consistent language with Kentucky Strengthening Families, an initiative that supports provision of protective factors to promote optimal child growth and family well-being. Resource and training materials continue to be developed.

Current SLA Training: Evidence-Based Practices

o Coaching with parents/caregivers: In-depth professional development on coaching parents/caregivers is a major activity in the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) currently implemented in pilot sites through a contract with the University of Louisville. The program is Coaching in Early Intervention Training and Mentoring Program (CEITMP).

o Family Assessment: The training and technical assistance staff at the SLA obtained certification as trainers of The Routine-Based Interview® by Robin McWilliam. 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. Provision of coaching regularly addresses issues uncovered in the fidelity checks. A Community of Practice for POE Managers and a series of POE Manager Leadership online modules launched in fall 2018. These activities are included in the SSIP.

o Provider Role in Early Intervention: All providers are required to take two trainings related to the purpose and vision of early intervention to fulfill the contract training hours. The two modules are Mission and Key Principles of Part C Early Intervention and Foundational Pillars of Early Intervention. These two modules provide the foundational knowledge required to participate as an early intervention provider in Kentucky.

Training Collaboration with Other State Initiatives

Governor's Office of Early Childhood, Early Childhood Advisory Council (ECAC): The Part C Coordinator is an appointed member of the Early Childhood Advisory Council (ECAC). As such, Part C is included in ECAC discussions on professional development. SLA staff sit on the Professional Development and Family Engagement subcommittees of the ECAC.

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 to ensure that early intervention is contributing to training projects as appropriate.

Early Hearing Detection and Intervention (EHDI): The lead agency for EHDI, the Office for Children with Special Health Care Needs (OCSHCN), and First Steps continue working together to identify and treat infants with hearing loss. A Part C representative is a member of the EHDI Advisory Board. The OCSHCN provides the training on the use of Otoacoustic Emissions (OAE) for hearing screens.

Kentucky Commission for Deaf and Hard of Hearing and Statewide Educational Resource Center on Deafness: A memorandum of agreement supports parent training provided by the Statewide Resource Center on Deafness in conjunction with the Kentucky Commission for Deaf and Hard of Hearing.

Childcare Health Consultation/Social Emotional Development training: First Steps staff worked with the Early Childhood Mental Health Social/Emotional Development technical assistant to adapt a training initially developed for preschool children called Connect the Dots. The adapted module focuses on parents and addresses the infant and toddler age group. Current piloting includes modules adapted for parents of children identified with autism and parents of children with Down syndrome. Staff from the Health Access Nurturing Development Services (HANDS) also participates on this workgroup.

Kentucky Strengthening Families: Part C staff are members of the training and technical assistance workgroup for Kentucky Strengthening Families.

Stakeholder Involvement:

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP/APR, and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 11, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

Stakeholder input is a foundational component of the Kentucky Early Intervention. Stakeholders include 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) included gathering data, 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. Workgroups may be convened to address specific topics. The stakeholder groups review and recommend revisions to improvement activities after evaluating the status. Each year the ICC receives a formal presentation of the SPP/APR. The ICC has certified the APR each year due to this collaborative process for development.

Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part C results indicators (y/n)

YES

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2017 performance of each EIS Program 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 2017 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, is available.

Annually, the SPP and APR posting is on the First Steps website upon submission to the US Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs. The website address is: <https://chfs.ky.gov/agencies/dph/dmch/ecdb/Pages/fsreports.aspx>

Interested parties without web access can contact the SLA 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. Local POE Determinations, based on the achievement of performance plan targets, are published on the website no later than 120 days from the submission of the SPP/APR to OSEP. These reports are on the website in the section labeled First Steps Reports and State Performance.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Intro - OSEP Response

States were instructed to submit Phase III, Year Four, of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), indicator C-11, by April 1, 2020. The State provided the required information. The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the target.

Intro - Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the

State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

OSEP notes that one or more of the attachments included in the State's FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Include the State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select early intervention service (EIS) programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. States report in both the numerator and denominator under Indicator 1 on the number of children for whom the State ensured the timely initiation of new services identified on the IFSP. Include the timely initiation of new early intervention services from both initial IFSPs and subsequent IFSPs. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

The State's timeliness measure for this indicator must be either: (1) a time period that runs from when the parent consents to IFSP services; or (2) the IFSP initiation date (established by the IFSP Team, including the parent).

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in the Office of Special Education Programs' (OSEP's) response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	79.00%
-----------------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.87%	99.50%	97.95%	94.85%	97.82%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
6,330	6,522	97.82%	100%	97.19%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

9

Include your State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

Timely service is defined as delivered no later than 30 days from date of IFSP meeting that service was initially authorized.

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

State database

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

July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019

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

Every IFSP (initial, six-month, requested review, and annual) is entered into TOTS, the online database management system. One section of the IFSP (Planned Services) includes all services planned for delivery during the period of the IFSP and 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. Then the number of days between date of the IFSP and the date of the first service is calculated. A report, Timely Services, lists every initial date of service for the IFSP period. The POE Manager reviews the Timely Services report and SLA staff verify the POE Manager's assessment. As part of the preparation of the State Performance Report, a different individual at the SLA reviews and verifies the report. For consistency, a comparison of the results of the report with the monthly reports submitted by the POEs occurs.

If needed, provide additional information about this indicator here.

The fifteen (15) Points of Entry (POE) demonstrated maintenance of previous high performance or improved during this reporting period. Eleven (11) POEs were at 100% compliance which is an increase from three (3) in FFY17. One (1) POE achieved 99% and two (2) others were at 98%. The lowest compliance rate was 92% by one (1) POE. Early intervention services that are authorized for less than weekly are typically the late service. The range in days late was 1-48; average length of time for delivery of initial service was seventeen (17) days. The main reason for delay was service provider scheduling, waiting to schedule until the 29th or 30th day of the timely services timeline. Other reasons included service provider illness or lack of transportation. The initial intermittent service of nutrition was frequently not scheduled during the first 30 days.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	2	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

There were two (2) findings of non-compliance for FFY17 during the formal monitoring period. SLA staff monitored data depicting the POE's compliance to this indicator monthly, including a review of internal procedures at the POE. Re-training on regulatory requirements was part of the corrective action. The SLA staff discussed the reasons for the noncompliance with each agency and provider. Additional required corrective actions focused on time-management and follow-up with parents to verify service delivery. Correction was achieved within two months. The other POE made significant progress as new staff were hired that allowed improved monitoring of the providers, ensuring timely services. Maintenance of compliance continues at this POE.

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

Based on the timely services report for FFY17, each child's record on TOTS with an initial service delivery over 30 days was reviewed, focusing on the date of the IFSP, the date of the initial service delivery and service log documentation. Records in TOTS include time of service delivery. Each finding of noncompliance was checked to ensure services were delivered, even when thirty (30) days from the IFSP date; and a review of data between the date of the IFSP meeting and the eventual service delivery. In each case services were delivered as authorized although past the thirty (30) day criteria.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2016	1	1	0

FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The SLA conducted monthly desk reviews of initial delivery of new services to ensure that regulations were being followed. The corrective action implemented to address correct of regulation included a staff training with SLA representative present on the required regulations. The POE also developed detailed explanations for changes to internal procedures to ensure timely delivery of services. Provider meetings were held to reinforce understanding of the timeline as this is an issue of provider scheduling. Individual providers were required to submit corrective action plans to the POE as well. The SLA conducted monthly desk review of Indicator 1 to ensure that regulations were being followed.

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

The SLA reviewed every case of service delivery that occurred thirty days or later than the IFSP meeting date. While noncompliances for FFY16 could not be reversed, it was documented in service notes and claims that the services were provided although late. Many of the children impacted by the noncompliance exited the program. The majority of late services were those services that were provided intermittently during the IFSP period. The POE was in compliance for FFY17 and has not dipped below 100% to date.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Instructions and Measurement

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)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's 618 data reported in Table 2. If not, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	98.70%
-----------------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target>=	98.70%	98.70%	98.70%	98.70%	98.70%
Data	99.18%	99.66%	99.58%	99.57%	99.53%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=	98.70%	98.70%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input is a foundational component of the Kentucky Early Intervention. Stakeholders include 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) included gathering data, 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. Workgroups may be convened to address specific topics. The stakeholder groups review and recommend revisions to improvement activities after evaluating the status. Each year the ICC receives a formal presentation of the SPP/APR. The ICC has certified the APR each year due to this collaborative process for development.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	5,184
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	5,194

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
5,184	5,194	99.53%	98.70%	99.81%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Kentucky continues to have the overwhelming majority of children and families served in natural environments. This commitment to supporting children where they live and play leads to transition into inclusive settings. As in the past, children served in clinics, rehabilitation centers, and other settings that do not meet the federal definition are those children for whom no provider could be located to travel to the home or community setting. The early intervention service that is most difficult to find a provider to work in the natural environment is physical therapy. All ten (10) children who did not receive services in the natural environment received physical therapy in a clinic.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

The State provided a FFY 2019 target for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

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)

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- 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.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in category (d)) divided by (# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e)) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of infants and toddlers with IFSPs is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement, include in the numerator and denominator only infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Report: (1) the number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's Part C exiting data under Section 618 of the IDEA; and (2) the number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements.

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Process (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

If the State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i), the State must report data in two ways. First, it must report on all eligible children but exclude its at-risk infants and toddlers (i.e., include just those infants and toddlers experiencing developmental delay (or "developmentally delayed children") or having a diagnosed physical or mental condition that has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay (or "children with diagnosed conditions")). Second, the State must separately report outcome data on either: (1) just its at-risk infants and toddlers; or (2) aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C (including developmentally delayed children, children with diagnosed conditions, and at-risk infants and toddlers).

3 - Indicator Data

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)? (yes/no)

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input is a foundational component of the Kentucky Early Intervention. Stakeholders include 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) included gathering data, 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. Workgroups may be convened to address specific topics. The stakeholder groups review and recommend revisions to improvement activities after evaluating the status. Each year the ICC receives a formal presentation of the SPP/APR. The ICC has certified the APR each year due to this collaborative process for development.

A workgroup of a variety of stakeholders set the original targets. This process has been used to re-set targets in 2013 and met again in 2019.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2008	Target>=	86.00%	86.01%	86.02%	86.03%	86.04%
A1	70.10%	Data	86.37%	85.71%	88.30%	87.98%	86.50%
A2	2008	Target>=	68.98%	68.98%	68.99%	69.00%	69.00%
A2	48.10%	Data	68.98%	65.19%	65.83%	63.76%	64.05%
B1	2008	Target>=	90.66%	90.66%	90.67%	90.68%	90.69%
B1	61.80%	Data	90.66%	91.39%	91.74%	91.23%	91.79%
B2	2008	Target>=	71.54%	71.54%	71.55%	71.55%	71.55%
B2	28.80%	Data	71.54%	68.47%	69.96%	68.92%	68.28%
C1	2008	Target>=	85.77%	85.77%	85.78%	85.79%	85.80%
C1	57.30%	Data	85.77%	83.92%	84.91%	85.23%	83.13%
C2	2008	Target>=	53.80%	53.80%	53.81%	53.82%	53.83%
C2	29.10%	Data	53.80%	48.86%	49.23%	46.71%	46.16%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1>=	86.05%	70.20%
Target A2>=	69.00%	48.20%
Target B1>=	90.70%	62.00%
Target B2>=	71.55%	44.00%
Target C1>=	85.80%	70.10%
Target C2>=	53.84%	48.10%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

3,540

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	113	3.19%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	211	5.96%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,005	28.39%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,031	29.12%

	Number of children	Percentage of Total
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,180	33.33%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
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	2,036	2,360	86.50%	86.05%	86.27%	Met Target	No Slippage
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	2,211	3,540	64.05%	69.00%	62.46%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable

Slippage occurred in FFY18 for all summary statements with the exception of A1 and C1. The difference in scores for Summary Statement 1, the percent of children who entered or exited the program below age expectations and substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program, are small. For all outcomes, there has been a gradual decline in scores for Summary Statement 2, the percent of children who were functioning within age expectations by the time they exited the program, over the last five years. Approximately two-thirds of the children served were over age 1 at the time of referral. This means limited time is available for early intervention. To expect significant gains while served for a limited time is a false expectation for many children. While some variability is anticipated due to natural fluctuations, there are several key factors that have been identified as having the potential to impact the results for Kentucky including:

- A 14% increase in children with an established risk condition since 2016;
- A 55% increase in the number of children of served with diagnoses of autism spectrum disorder;
- More children and families affected by the opioid crisis with resultant disruptions in stable, nurturing relationships, family routines and interventions;
- Greater number of children being raised by grandparents with different expectations for development;
- Cultural shifts including more families with two parents in the workforce; increased use of electronic devices; decreased family time for intervention routines;
- Maintenance of strict eligibility criteria for Part C; and
- Increased numbers of children served with diagnosed conditions of established risk, which represent the group of children with greatest length of service and greatest needs.

Thus, Kentucky's Part C population is experiencing an increase in children with more significant developmental delays and at higher risk with a greater strain on the ability of families to address the needs of children. It is anticipated that the impact of the key factors identified on the state's progress data and their contribution to the gradual decline in scores will continue.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	47	1.33%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	147	4.15%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	942	26.61%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,070	30.23%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,334	37.68%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
--	-----------	-------------	---------------	-----------------	---------------	--------	----------

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
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	2,012	2,206	91.79%	90.70%	91.21%	Met Target	No Slippage
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	2,404	3,540	68.28%	71.55%	67.91%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	77	2.18%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	454	12.82%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,437	40.59%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,300	36.72%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	272	7.68%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
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	2,737	3,268	83.13%	85.80%	83.75%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
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	1,572	3,540	46.16%	53.84%	44.41%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable

Approximately two-thirds of the children served were over age 1 at the time of referral. This means limited time is available for early intervention. To expect significant gains while served for a limited time is a false expectation for many children. While some variability is anticipated due to natural fluctuations, there are several key factors that have been identified as having the potential to impact the results for Kentucky including:

- A 14% increase in children with an established risk condition since 2016. These are the children with greatest length of service and greatest needs;
- A 55% increase in the number of children of served with diagnoses of autism spectrum disorder;
- Increased number of children and families affected by the opioid crisis with resultant disruptions in stable, nurturing relationships, family routines and interventions;
- Greater number of children being raised by grandparents with different expectations for development;
- Cultural shifts including more families with two parents in the workforce; increased use of electronic devices; decreased family time for intervention routines; and,
- Maintenance of strict eligibility criteria for Part C.

Additionally, for this specific indicator, communication, social and motor skill development are required. The assessments may not measure progress specifically enough to capture the progress more precisely for this outcome.

The number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's part C exiting 618 data	4,841
The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.	122

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

NO

Provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.”

Data analysis for OSEP reporting was based on two levels of detailed crosswalks as conducted by instrument publishers and early childhood experts. The first level of instrument crosswalks included two detailed steps. First, each publisher aligned specific items on their assessment to the KY EC Standards and benchmarks. KY early childhood staff reviewed, revised, and approved these alignments. Second, an early childhood panel (including assessment and child development experts) reviewed each crosswalk to ensure full coverage of each benchmark and consistent alignment with KY EC Standards across approved instruments. The expert panel mapped individual items to benchmarks and age-anchored all items. This first process was the foundation to define “comparable to same-aged peers”. To determine an age-anchor, the panel utilized age intervals already identified by the assessment, compared similar items from other assessments, and examined recommended behavioral sequences (i.e., Cohen and Gross, 1979). All items were assigned to a three (3) month age band to determine “age-appropriate functioning.” All instrument crosswalks were updated annually as publishers revised instruments.

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Three assessment instruments were used for monitoring children's progress:

- Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System for Infants and Children Second Edition (AEPS; Bricker et al., 2002);
- Carolina Curriculum for Infants and Toddlers with Special Needs (CCITSN; Johnson-Martin et al., 2004); and
- Hawaii Early Learning Profile (HELP; Parks, 2006).

Each child referred to Part C are assessed with one of the instruments listed above. Each assessment item is entered into a data portal, the Kentucky Early Childhood Data System (KEDS). The initial assessment is the baseline. Annually and/or at exit, one of the approved instruments listed above are again administered and entered into the KEDS platform. The platform is designed to prevent missing data.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The data table presents the required data under this SPP with baseline of 2008. The attachment is a proposed change to the KY targets and data analysis. The proposed change uses FFY18 as the baseline for measurement under the new system. FFY19 Target Change Request--See attached document for full description, including tables.

Kentucky convened a stakeholder workgroup to conduct a review of the current Child Outcomes measurement system. After a thorough review of extensive data, the stakeholder group recommended a different, more reflective method to set cut scores and to calculate assessment results. This lead to a need to reset targets. Kentucky requests approval from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) to reset the child outcomes targets based on a thorough review of outcomes data and stakeholder input.

Stakeholder Input: A stakeholder workgroup convened in October 2019 to study Kentucky assessment data. The stakeholder group represented parents, evaluators, early intervention providers, Points of Entry (POE) staff, state agency staff including the Governor's Office of Early Childhood, and university experts in child development and evaluation. The stakeholder workgroup also represented a variety of early intervention disciplines. First Steps staff and Kentucky Early Childhood Data System (KEDS) at the University of Kentucky staff organized and facilitated the meetings. The Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Stakeholders reviewed the recommendations during the January 2020 meeting. There were questions posed by those who did not participate on the smaller workgroup that lead to discussion. The ICC/SSIP Stakeholders approved including this request in the FFY18 APR.

Workgroup Charge:

- 1) Provide detailed information on the First Steps' assessment system;
- 2) Provide an overview of federal requirements;
- 3) Determine most appropriate assessment or assessments for outcome reporting;
- 4) Determine accurate information to report child progress; and
- 5) Revise child outcome targets for OSEP reporting and identify sufficient justification to support change.

Proposed Expanded Benchmark Methodology (foundation for target reset)

A pilot of modifications to the methodology for the child outcomes analysis process began in FFY14. This approach, called the Expanded Benchmark Approach, was determined to more accurately measure child progress at exit by increasing the number of items based on all Kentucky Early Childhood Standards, while narrowing the item pool examined at entry and exit to the 6-month interval representing the child's chronological age at the time of assessment. This approach increases content coverage and more evenly distributes item pools across outcomes by including items identified for all 24 benchmarks as compared to fourteen (14) benchmarks. In addition, a single 6-month age-band is used to assess functioning relative to same-age peers when calculating outcome scores. In contrast, the calculation used in the original approach used cumulative summing of multiple 3-month age bands. With the new approach, growth continues to be determined by calculating the change in percent correct on each outcome from entry to exit assessments and then categorizing into five levels of functioning for each outcome as specified by OSEP. The criteria for the categories were adjusted to reflect the Expanded Benchmark approach changes:

- Level (a) included children who exhibited no change or a decrease in item scores;
- Level (b) included children who exhibited a gain in item scores, but did not make any relative progress;
- Level (c) included children who made relative progress nearer to age-appropriate functioning but did not reach functioning on 40% or more outcome items;
- Level (d) included children whose entry scores were below age-appropriate functioning, but who reached age-appropriate functioning on 40% or more outcome items by exit; and
- Level (e) included children who maintained age-appropriate functioning on 40% or more outcome items from entry to exit. The 40% criteria level was based on research and consultation with national and state assessment experts.

The modifications to the methodology for the Expanded Benchmark Approach require new baselines and targets. Baselines under the new methodology are lower than the baselines established in 2013. The methodology for analysis includes additional items and modifies the item pool to a 6-month interval (improved alignment with chronological age at time of assessment). Maintaining current baseline and targets would then be incongruent with the methodology and be inappropriate targets. Current targets are not applicable to the results of the expanded methodology.

3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided its targets for FFY2019 for this indicator, but OSEP cannot accept those targets because the State's end targets for FFY 2019 do not reflect improvement over the FFY 2018 baseline data. The State must revise its FFY 2019 targets to reflect improvement.

3 - Required Actions

3 - State Attachments

The attachment(s) included are in compliance with Section 508. Non-compliant attachments will be made available by the State.



FFY19 Target
Reset.pdf

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Instructions and Measurement

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)

Data Source

State selected data source. State must describe the data source in the SPP/APR.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of families participating in Part C is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of families to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the infant or toddler, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the families responding are not representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to families (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person), if a survey was used, and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

4 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2007	Target>=	99.45%	99.45%	99.45%	99.45%	99.45%
A	83.20%	Data	99.45%	99.77%	99.61%	99.14%	99.10%
B	2007	Target>=	99.52%	99.52%	99.52%	99.52%	99.52%
B	74.30%	Data	99.52%	99.70%	99.55%	99.39%	99.28%
C	2007	Target>=	99.03%	99.03%	99.03%	99.03%	99.03%
C	89.60%	Data	99.03%	99.62%	99.16%	99.20%	98.97%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A>=	99.45%	99.45%
Target B>=	99.52%	99.52%
Target C>=	99.03%	99.03%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input is a foundational component of the Kentucky Early Intervention. Stakeholders include 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) included gathering data, 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. Workgroups may be convened to address specific topics. The stakeholder groups review and recommend revisions to improvement activities after evaluating the status. Each year the ICC receives a formal presentation of the SPP/APR. The ICC has certified the APR each year due to this collaborative process for development.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	5,429
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	1,473
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	1,410
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	1,427
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	1,415
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	1,427
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	1,413
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	1,427

	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2)	99.10%	99.45%	98.81%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2)	99.28%	99.52%	99.16%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2)	98.97%	99.03%	99.02%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	NO

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

A list of families from the fifteen (15) Point of Entry offices, whose child had participated in First Steps within a 120-day period is generated from TOTS (data management system). This method of surveying was approved by the state's OSEP project officer in FFY10. The sampling was determined to be valid since it includes all families who received Kentucky Early Intervention System services for the 120-day period. No stratification of the sample population is conducted. Prior to conducting the family survey, POE Managers are informed of the projected date of survey distribution so they have the necessary time to notify staff. Service Coordinators are encouraged to obtain email addresses for families on their caseload and to enter them into Kentucky's data management system (TOTS). POE staff are also encouraged to inform parents that they may receive a family survey and to explain to families the importance of their feedback. The electronic and paper survey tools include a comment box for families to report any additional information that they deem important. The electronic version of the survey is initially distributed with an email that explains the family survey and includes a link for the parent to access the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Family Outcomes survey. The email also includes the contact information for the First Steps Parent Consultant in case the family has any questions or concerns. The 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 and is tied to each child's electronic record. Through TOTS, the SLA is able to re-send 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 (1) month.

Section B of the Early Childhood Outcomes Survey, which is used for APR reporting, focuses on the three (3) helpfulness indicators required for OSEP reporting and contains seventeen (17) items. Section B uses a five(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.

Was a collection tool used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised collection tool?	NO
The demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.	YES

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.

The survey distribution was consistent with the July 1, 2018 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. Kentucky is not an ethnically diverse state based on the 2010 Census report. The 2010 census data report states that of the 282,387 birth to four (4) data that was collected, 221,096 were White, 25,913 were Black, 3,878 were Asian, 12,940 were Other and 18,540 were Hispanic. The Kentucky Data Center, 2018 population estimates state that of the 276,883 estimated Kentuckians that are birth to four: 214,715 are projected to be White, 25,448 are projected to be Black, 4,618 are projected to be Asian, 13,497 are projected to be Other and 18,605 are projected to be Hispanic. Based on these estimates, of the birth to 4 population, approximately 77% are projected to be white, 9% Black, 1% Asian, 4% Other and 6% Hispanic. The percentages of the birth to 4 population with significant developmental disabilities would be projected to be even smaller.

By comparison, the response rate data for the Kentucky's Early Intervention System Family Survey was disaggregated by race. The survey results show a response rate of 83% White, 5% Black, 4% Two or more races, 2% Asian, .27% Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander and 5% Hispanic. Even though the race/ethnicity groups are not perfectly aligned, the survey results do align with the population estimates.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In FFY 2018, 306 more surveys were distributed as compared to FFY 2017 because of the growth in the number of children and families served. Despite the increased distribution, there were 257 fewer responses. It is opined that fewer responses this contributed to the lower results (although not considered slippage). Survey fatigue may be an influence to the return rate since there are many requests for various surveys. Additionally there is no tangible incentive for survey completion and return. The responses that are received are most often from families who feel very strongly about the early intervention services that they received.

4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

4 - Required Actions

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Instructions and Measurement

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)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)) and Census (for the denominator).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	0.49%
-----------------	------	-------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	0.49%	0.51%	0.52%	0.52%	0.52%
Data	0.49%	0.59%	0.57%	0.66%	0.62%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	0.52%	0.52%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input is a foundational component of the Kentucky Early Intervention. Stakeholders include 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) included gathering data, 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. Workgroups may be convened to address specific topics. The stakeholder groups review and recommend revisions to improvement activities after evaluating the status. Each year the ICC receives a formal presentation of the SPP/APR. The ICC has certified the APR each year due to this collaborative process for development.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	290
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/20/2019	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	53,557

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
290	53,557	0.62%	0.52%	0.54%	Met Target	No Slippage

Compare your results to the national data

The national percentage of children ages birth to one is 1.25. Kentucky has a restrictive eligibility so it is expected that the Kentucky data is less than the national data.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Kentucky exceeded the FFY18 target for this indicator; however the results are lower than FFY17. In general, the POEs have experienced an increase in referrals, most of those for children over age 1. In FFY 16 there were 9,546 referrals statewide and in FFY18 the number rose to 10,912. FFY19 data indicates another increase to 11,700. FFY20 referrals are expected to top 12,500. Due to staff shortages at many of the POEs and the influx of referrals, specific targeted child find activities for the birth to 1 year population were fewer as staff worked on meeting the 45-day timeline. Also it is suspected that since the target was met in FFY17, some POEs may have mistakenly assumed the higher rate would hold without continuing targeted activities.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Instructions and Measurement

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)

Data Source

Data collected under IDEA section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)) and Census (for the denominator).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

6 - Indicator Data

Baseline	2005	2.17%
-----------------	------	-------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	2.53%	2.54%	2.55%	2.55%	2.55%
Data	2.53%	2.67%	2.69%	2.92%	3.08%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	2.55%	2.55%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input is a foundational component of the Kentucky Early Intervention. Stakeholders include 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) included gathering data, 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. Workgroups may be convened to address specific topics. The stakeholder groups review and recommend revisions to improvement activities after evaluating the status. Each year the ICC receives a formal presentation of the SPP/APR. The ICC has certified the APR each year due to this collaborative process for development.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	5,194
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/20/2019	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	163,664

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
5,194	163,664	3.08%	2.55%	3.17%	Met Target	No Slippage

Compare your results to the national data

Kentucky's result for Indicator 6 was 3.17%. The national rate is 3.48%--Kentucky is closer to the national rate than it's ever been before.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

Instructions and Measurement

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)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must address the timeline from point of referral to initial IFSP meeting based on actual, not an average, number of days.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

7 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	61.00%
-----------------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.79%	98.80%	88.01%	89.07%	95.43%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2,025	3,028	95.43%	100%	95.97%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

881

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

State database

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

July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019

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

All referrals are entered into the online database management system known as TOTS and assigned a unique identifier. The system matched the date of the initial IFSP with the date of referral and calculated the forty-five (45) day timeline. A report, Single Timeline Report, was generated for the date range indicated above (July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019) that includes all children who had an initial IFSP developed during the period. Monthly, POE Managers are required to verify the reason an initial IFSP is late. SLA staff review monthly reports to verify the reason for late initial IFSPs. In preparation for submitting the Annual Performance Report, a different SLA 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)

FFY18 data indicates slight improvement over last year. One hundred twenty-two (122) initial IFSPs were untimely; the FFY17 number was one hundred thirty-six (336). The range in days was one (1) to twenty-three (23) days. Nine (9) POEs achieved 100% timely IFSPs. One POE performed at 99%, two (2) POEs were 98% and two (2) others were at 97%. One POE maintained a performance percentage of 85% for a second year. This was the second year of significant vacancies and remaining service coordinators with caseloads of 85 and higher. As of late summer 2019 the POE is fully staffed. Reasons for delay included poor time management by the service coordinator and human error. Weather issues that impeded travel (flooded roads) was cited a few cases in one mountainous region.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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	0	1	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

SLA staff monitor the POE's compliance to this indicator monthly, including a report of efforts to fill vacancies. The SLA staff discussed the regulatory requirements and reasons for the noncompliance with the agency leadership and service coordinators. Training on regulatory requirements was also part of the corrective action. Other corrective actions focused on time-management and re-examination of internal procedures to move cases from referral to IFSP to ensure compliance with regulation. Correction was achieved by August 2019.

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

The SLA verified correction of each case of noncompliance by:

1. Reviewing each child's record on TOTS that was over 45 days from referral to IFSP. This was 367 records. Review included the dates of the IFSP, initial referral, communication log entries and service log entries. A timeline was established for each case, noting gaps in documentation along with possible reasons for delays.
2. An IFSP was verified for each case (although late) that met the regulatory requirements.
3. Compensatory services were offered for cases where the delay was longer than 10 days.
4. There was ongoing review of monthly data by SLA staff to ensure compliance with the requirement at 100%. Any deviation from 100% resulted in technical assistance with the POE.
5. Of the 367 children reviewed, 234 had exited the Part C system by June 30, 2018. The remaining cases continues to receive services, according to regulations.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2016	1	1	0

FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

SLA staff monitored the POE's compliance to this indicator monthly, including a report of efforts to fill vacancies. Random cases were pulled for review of timelines and documentation to ensure compliance with regulation. The SLA staff discussed the regulatory requirements and reasons for the noncompliance with the agency leadership and service coordinators. Training on regulatory requirements was implemented as part of the corrective action. Once vacancies were filled, intense training of new service coordinators ensued.

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

The SLA verified correction of each case of noncompliance by:

1. Reviewing each child's record on TOTS that was over 45 days from referral to IFSP. Review included the dates of the IFSP, initial referral, communication log entries and service log entries. A timeline was established for each case, noting gaps in documentation along with possible reasons for delays.
2. An IFSP was verified for each case (although late).
3. Compensatory services were offered for cases where the delay was longer than 10 days.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

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)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005				
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 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)

YES

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
4,852	5,164	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

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" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

312

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

State database

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

July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019

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

TOTS, the database management system, requires a transition outcome with appropriate steps and early intervention services in every IFSP. Guidance to service coordinators and early intervention services providers includes this requirement and provides a framework for identifying typical transitions that infants and toddlers experience. As a child nears two (2) years of age, transition focus becomes planning for exit from Part C services.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

8A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8A - OSEP Response

8A - Required Actions

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

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)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8B - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	100.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

YES

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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
3,635	3,753	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

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" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.

118

Describe the method used to collect these data

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/no)

YES

If yes, is the policy on file with the Department? (yes/no)

YES

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

State database

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

July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019

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 section or screen. The screen includes all key elements of the transition from Part C to Part B. An electronic file exchange process with the State Education Agency (SEA) was developed as a part of the State Improvement Grant several years ago. A report is available through TOTS that lists all directory information for children ages 2 and older. The list is generated quarterly.

There is a data-sharing agreement between Part C and the SEA to facilitate transition. The database system is designed to default to parent agreement for transition activities. Parents have the option to refuse notification of the local education agency and/or the SEA. Parents that choose this option must provide written indication of their desire to opt-out and the Service Coordinator must change the field on TOTS so that the refusal is stored electronically. Parents are informed both verbally and in writing that this refusal can be changed at any time.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

8B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8B - OSEP Response

8B - Required Actions

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

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)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- A. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C})] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B})] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B})] \times 100$.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8C - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	90.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.83%	99.47%	96.82%	98.57%	98.23%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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)

YES

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
3,279	3,637	98.23%	100%	98.95%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.

312

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 not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

11

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

State database

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

July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019

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 list of all children assigned to the Service Coordinator 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. Other data elements collected on the screen are date parent consented to convene the meeting and date of LEA invitation to the meeting. These prompts assist the Service Coordinator's compliance with timelines.

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 the SLA staff.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

There were 46 late transition meetings statewide during this reporting period. The majority (36) of those were late by 1-4 days due to late referrals to the Part C system. Attempts to include the LEA representative accounted for 6 untimely transition meetings. Four cases were untimely due to service coordinator scheduling.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	2	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

There were two (2) findings of non-compliance for FFY17 during the monitoring period. SLA staff monitored the POE's compliance to this indicator monthly by reviewing each case reported for the month. Additionally, the SLA staff discussed the regulatory requirements and reasons for the noncompliance with leadership of each agency. Re-training on regulatory requirements was part of the corrective action for the POE with the lowest performance. Other required corrective actions focused on re-examination of internal procedures to ensure service coordinators understood actions needed to meet the timelines.

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

There were two (2) findings of non-compliance for FFY17 during the monitoring period. One POE corrected within one month of the issuance of the finding and the other corrected within six (6) months of issuance. The SLA verified correction of each case by:

1. Based on the POE Transition Report, each child's record on TOTS with a late transition meeting was reviewed, focusing on the date of the meeting, the date parent consented to the meeting, date of the LEA invitation to the transition meeting, and communication log and service log (service note) documentation. Each finding of noncompliance was checked to ensure a meeting was held, even when less than ninety (90) days prior to the third birthday or if the child had exited the program; and,

2. Review of data between the initial date the meeting was scheduled and the eventual meeting date.
3. There was ongoing review of monthly data by SLA staff to ensure compliance with the requirement at 100%. Any deviation from 100% resulted in technical assistance with the POE.
4. Of the 61 untimely transition meetings, all 61 children had exited the Part C system by 6/30/2018.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

8C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8C - OSEP Response

The State did not demonstrate that the EIS program or provider corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that the remaining two findings identified in FFY 2017 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

8C - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

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)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

This indicator is not applicable to a State that has adopted Part C due process procedures under section 639 of the IDEA.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Select yes to use target ranges.

Target Range not used

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input is a foundational component of the Kentucky Early Intervention. Stakeholders include 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) included gathering data, 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. Workgroups may be convened to address specific topics. The stakeholder groups review and recommend revisions to improvement activities after evaluating the status. Each year the ICC receives a formal presentation of the SPP/APR. The ICC has certified the APR each year due to this collaborative process for development.

Historical Data

Baseline		

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target>=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Kentucky Part C does not use Part B due process policies. Kentucky uses Part C provisions therefore this indicator is not applicable. Kentucky did not and has not set targets for this indicator per instruction from OSEP. Not applicable was marked on the submission screen but that prevented submission of the entire APR. According to the PSC help desk, Indicator 9 must be marked as "Ready to Submit" for the APR to successfully submit.

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

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)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = $((2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) \text{ divided by } 2.1) \text{ times } 100$.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

10 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input is a foundational component of the Kentucky Early Intervention. Stakeholders include 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) included gathering data, 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. Workgroups may be convened to address specific topics. The stakeholder groups review and recommend revisions to improvement activities after evaluating the status. Each year the ICC receives a formal presentation of the SPP/APR. The ICC has certified the APR each year due to this collaborative process for development.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005				
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target>=	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Data					

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=	80.00%	80.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0		80.00%		N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

No mediation sessions were requested and/or held in FFY18.

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten meditations held in FFY 2018. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

The State did not submit 508 compliant attachments. Non-compliant attachments will be made available by the State.

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Director of the State's Lead Agency under Part C of the IDEA, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role

Designated Lead Agency Director

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Paula E. Goff

Title:

Part C Coordinator, Early Childhood Development Branch Manager

Email:

paula.goff@ky.gov

Phone:

502/564-3756 ext. 4375

Submitted on:

04/27/20 7:31:24 AM

ED Attachments



2020 HTDMD Part
C.pdf



KY
-resultsmatrix-2020c



KY-aprltr-2020c.pdf



KY-2020DataRubricP
artC.pdf



KY-C Dispute
Resolution 2018-19.