

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

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

**For reporting on
FFY18**

Florida



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 Florida Department of Health (FDOH) is the lead agency for Part C of the Individuals with Education Act (IDEA) in Florida. Within FDOH, the Division of Children's Medical Services (CMS), Bureau of Early Steps and Newborn Screening is responsible for the program oversight, which includes, but is not limited to: the development of the state policies that are consistent with Part C of IDEA regulations, state law and agency policies and procedures; oversight of the dispute resolution system; programmatic and contract monitoring of local Early Steps programs (LES); continuous improvement process; local determinations process; public reporting; development and implementation of statewide personnel standards; a professional development system; federal reporting; federal grant management; and fiscal oversight and accountability.

The Early Steps program is administered throughout the state in 15 geographic regions through contracts with 14 organizations. Local Early Steps programs are the contracted entities that evaluate and assess all referred infants and toddlers by working with internal and community service providers, and other community resources.

The Early Steps program maintains a statewide interagency coordinating council called the Florida Interagency Coordinating Council for Infants and Toddlers (FICCIT). Per Part C of IDEA federal regulation 34 CFR § 303.604, the role of FICCIT is to advise and assist Florida's Early Steps program in the performance of its responsibilities.

The Early Steps State Office comprises a Program Administrator, who is the designated Part C Coordinator; two unit supervisors; programmatic staff, who provide program consultation for local Early Steps programs; budgetary and contract management staff; data analysts; and additional resources within FDOH, as needed.

Early Steps program has worked with the U.S. Department of Education (ED), Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) and participated in technical assistance opportunities available through national centers funded by OSEP, including the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA), the IDEA Data Center (IDC), the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy), and the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI). Technical assistance (TA) providers Sherry Franklin, Grace Kelley, and Vera Stroup-Rentier provided TA focused on Florida's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Florida has maintained regular contact with our OSEP lead, Kathleen Heck, through conference calls.

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.

Florida's General Supervision System

The FDOH Bureau of Early Steps and Newborn Screening within the Division of Children's Medical Services is responsible for the general supervision system. The Early Steps State Office carries out the following general supervision activities in accordance with Part C of IDEA federal regulations, state law and agency policies and procedures: development and oversight of a state performance plan and annual performance report; policies and procedures for effective IDEA implementation; programmatic monitoring activities, including strategies for improvement and corrective actions, a local determinations process, public reporting and contract desk and on-site monitoring of all 15 local Early Steps programs; a fiscal management system; a data system to gather data on processes and results; an effective dispute resolution system, including mediation, state complaints and due process hearings; technical assistance related to the implementation of the IDEA, statewide personnel standards and professional development, coordination and oversight of the FICCIT.

Geographic Regions

The Early Steps program is administered throughout the state in 15 geographic regions through contracts with 14 organizations. Local Early Steps programs are the contracted entities that evaluate and assess all referred infants and toddlers for determination of eligibility. LES programs provide direct early intervention services for eligible infants and toddlers by working with internal and community service providers, and other community resources.

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.

State Office Technical Assistance Provision

Technical assistance (TA) is provided in response to requests from individual programs or if identified by the Early Steps State Office. Focused TA is provided through statewide policy clarifications via email, conference calls or webinars and if necessary individual local technical calls. TA is related to strategies for meeting federal timelines for evaluations, Individualized Family Support Plan (IFSP) meetings, service delivery and transition planning, implementation of evidence-based practices and ensuring efficient use of resources. Monthly conference calls with Directors and Coordinators are utilized to provide TA, and maintain open and clear statewide communication with local programs. Currently, each local program is assigned a Consultant at the state office who serves as a contact for issues the program may have of focused TA the Consultant may need to provide. The State Office recently implemented on-going data manager calls, where State data analysts provide feedback and in-service training on recent database system changes, how to implement those changes and where or how to submit requests or changes to the data system.

Currently, the Early Steps State Office is developing a Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS) to assist programs to identify sustainable improvement strategies. The teams will be organized around a continuum of supports, including training, technical assistance, policies, and technology improvements to assist the LESs in improving performance and compliance. The Early Steps State Office will use MTSS to also help those programs where compliance is difficult to meet or for those programs who have not corrected non-compliance with specific indicators.

Technical Assistance Received by The State

The Early Steps State Office requests technical assistance from national, state or local content experts on an ongoing basis, and materials created by OSEP-sponsored centers, such as Early Childhood Technical Center (ECTA), the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy), IDEA Data Center (IDC) and National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) are utilized.

Florida has regular contact with OSEP lead, Kathleen Heck, through email and conference calls. Technical assistance calls with Early Steps State Office staff, Kathleen Heck and OSEP, ECTA providers Grace Kelley, Sherry Franklin, Robin Nelson were held on January 19, March 19, 29, April 16, May 7, and June 19, 2019. Topics discussed during these communications included: Strategies for improvement regarding Accountability, Child Outcomes and Data Integrity.

The Part C Coordinator attended the OSEP Leadership Conference in Arlington, Virginia on July 21-24, 2019. In addition, the Part C Coordinator and lead agency staff, as appropriate, have participated in standing bi-weekly TA calls with staff from TA centers, including ECTA, IDC, DaSy, and NCSI. TA was provided to the State on a variety of topics, including state general supervision structures, accountability and monitoring, State Systemic Improvement Plan, collection and reporting of IDEA 618 data. Drafts of data reports and narratives for federal reporting have been provided to TA providers for review and input. TA was provided from ECTA on use of the Statewide Implementation Guide (SIG) as a process for improving child and family outcomes by implementing evidence-based practices. ECTA provided assistance related to identification of areas of strength and need in the state system and building key support structures. State staff gained an understanding of the State Leadership Team Benchmarks of Quality and options to apply the SIG in Florida. As a result, the state identified a need to refine and make clear the roles of state teams addressing implementation strategies.

New Interactive Data System

Florida continues to enhance the current data system, including adding new codes, removing obsolete codes, and clarifying code definitions, while a new data system vendor has been procured. The procurement was released in mid-2018 and the contract with the vendor for the new and enhanced data system is for five years. Information received from TA providers was very instrumental and used in the preparation for a new, high quality state data system. The State office has hired an additional data staff member to allow for more data analysis and expertise, as the new data system work continues.

Quality Assurance & Accountability Efforts

Lead agency staff continue to review the monitoring and accountability tools of other states in the peer-to-peer group and working with TA providers to implement methods to increase compliance and performance of local programs. Much of the input and edits provided by TA providers related to federal reports were incorporated into the reports prior to submission. State leads have been established to work on revising the manuals as needed.

Materials created by ECTA and DaSy are shared and discussed by Consultants during on-going technical assistance calls with local Early Step program directors, in addition to improvement strategies regarding provider enrollment, service delivery and child outcomes measurement.

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.

The professional development system includes mandatory pre-service training consisting of three orientation modules, service coordinator apprenticeship training, and data system training.

In-service training includes the Autism Navigator for Early Intervention Providers, a web-based instructional training program; an interactive e-learning community to support use of the Autism Navigator; and a train-the-trainer system for training assessors on the Battelle Developmental Inventory, Second Edition (BDI-2) assessment.

The Early Steps State Office is working to enhance the professional development infrastructure and increase training opportunities at the state and local level.

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).

Interagency Coordinating Council

The Early Steps program maintains a statewide interagency coordinating council called the Florida Interagency Coordinating Council for Infants and Toddlers (FICCIT). The role of FICCIT is to advise and assist Florida's Early Steps program in the performance of its responsibilities. FICCIT is comprised of governor appointed members who are representative of the state's population. Members from various fields, such as Early Head Start, the Agency for Health Care Administration, Department of Children and Families, Department of Education, and parents of infants and toddlers with disabilities are represented.

Stakeholder Workgroups

In accordance with section 391.308(2)(c), Florida Statutes, the Early Steps program is required to:

- Develop a State Plan annually, and
- Ensure the State Plan is developed through an inclusive process that involves families, local programs, health care providers, and other stakeholders.

The Early Steps program has established five workgroups, in partnership with the Local Early Steps programs and FICCIT, to assist with Early Steps strategic planning for program priorities.

The initial meeting of all groups was held in 2018, with 64 stakeholders in attendance. Each group includes a representative from FICCIT, Local Early Steps programs, parents, and other state agencies and programs that serve young children and their families. All of these stakeholder groups have provided opportunity for input in the preparation of the Early Steps state Plan. Input has been gathered through face-to-face, webinar and conference calls.

Stakeholder workgroups have also completed ECTA System Framework or the DaSy Data System Framework Self-Assessment as tools to record the current status of the state system and set priorities for improvement in each of the areas addressed by the workgroup. The results of these self-assessments have been used to develop sub-action and action steps for the State Office to consider for State planning and implementation. The groups meet at least quarterly or more frequently throughout the year to monitor progress towards implementation of action steps, review data to determine

progress, and provide additional information on achievements or challenges.

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

NO

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.

Florida reported to the public on the FFY 2017 performance of each local Early Steps program in the state by posting local performance profiles on the Early Steps website on May 29, 2019. This reporting can be found at http://www.cms-kids.com/providers/early_steps/reports/program_performance.html

The Early Steps State Office ensures that this reporting is updated annually no later than 120 days following the state's submission of the SPP/APR. Also available to the public on this website are the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) submitted February 2019 and Florida's Determination Letter.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2018 and 2019 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 18, 2019 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

The State has not publicly reported on the FFY 2017 (July 1, 2017-June 30, 2018) performance of each EIS program or provider located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA.

The State did not provide verification that the attachments it included in its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission, including the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), are in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), as required by Section 508 and noted in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR User Guides and technical webinar.

The State did not provide FFY 2018 data for indicator C-11/SSIP. Because the State did not provide data, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target. The State did not, as required by the measurement table, provide a target for FFY 2019 for Indicator C-11/SSIP.

Intro - Required Actions

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	57.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	87.78%	86.79%	86.43%	89.03%	88.67%

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
264	330	88.67%	100%	89.39%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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.

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).

Florida's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services is as soon as possible, but within 30 calendar days from when the family consented to the service unless there is documentation of a child or family related issue or natural disaster which caused the delay.

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

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

All 15 local Early Steps programs are monitored annually. This year's monitoring utilized a review of child record documentation and data. The monitoring sample was comprised of randomly selected child records based on the local program's size. A total of 330 records were reviewed for this indicator. Exceptional family circumstances included family schedule conflicts, child illness and unsuccessful attempts to contact the family.

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

XXX

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

XXX

If needed, provide additional information about this indicator here.

Key factors impacting performance for local early steps programs were service coordinator case ratios and provider capacity. A few programs struggle with service coordinator case ratios which impact time management and tracking due dates for service delivery. Another factor which impacts service delivery is provider availability in rural counties and the number of discipline-specific therapists available in varying regions.

The Early Steps State Office will continue to monitor and require recruitment of adequate number of service coordinators and well-trained providers.

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
12	9	0	3

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

To ensure noncompliant practices have been revised and the local Early Steps programs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, the Early Steps State Office conducted subsequent reviews of child records for each of the 12 local program with findings of noncompliance. The Early Steps State Office reviewed updated data through a subsequent sample of 118 records for the 12 programs. This was done by reviewing the record for each child's IFSP documents and case notes with service start date information. Nine of the twelve programs achieved 100% compliance in the subsequent review of the sample of records. The subsequent sample review verified correction of noncompliance for nine of the programs with findings. Three programs did not achieve 100% compliance.

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

Thirty-four of 300 children in 12 programs did not receive early intervention services in a timely manner. For each individual case of noncompliance, the Early Steps State Office verified that the local program initiated services for each of the 34 children, although late. The verification was completed by requiring the local programs to provide follow up and reporting with documentation of the proof that services were initiated, although late.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Three of the Early Steps programs still have findings of noncompliance.

These programs continue to work with the Early Steps State Office on program and process improvement strategies, and provide updates on a monthly basis. The monthly updates will be required until correction of compliance is achieved.

As described in the introduction, the Early Steps State Office is developing a tiered system of support to assist programs to identify sustainable improvement strategies. The teams will be organized around a continuum of supports, including training, technical assistance, policies, and technology improvements to assist the local Early Steps programs in improving performance and compliance.

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

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

1 - 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 it verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 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. Additionally, in its description of how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected, the State reported "Thirty-four of 300 children in 13 programs did not receive early intervention services in a timely manner", however, in the "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017" data box, the State reported only 12 findings of noncompliance identified. Because of this discrepancy OSEP is unable to determine the number of findings the State identified and verified as corrected in FFY 2017. Therefore, OSEP could not determine if the State ensured, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, that each EIS program or provider has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider.

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	45.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target>=	87.00%	88.00%	89.00%	90.00%	91.00%
Data	85.21%	83.90%	92.56%	92.29%	92.89%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=	92.00%	94.11%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

FFY 2013-2019 Targets were developed with input from the Early Steps Continuous Improvement Workgroup and the Florida Interagency Coordinating Council for Infants and Toddlers. The 94.11% target was set based on the where the current data baseline. As a result of the current data, the State does not anticipate a decrease in the data that will be reported for the next reporting period.

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	15,833
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	16,824

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
15,833	16,824	92.89%	92.00%	94.11%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

2 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 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)

YES

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

The Florida Child Outcomes Advisory Committee was formed in 2009 to review baseline data, assist with target setting, explore improvement activities and to problem-solve implementation issues for the Florida Birth to Five Child Outcome Measurement System. The committee includes representation from the State Office, the Department of Education (DOE), the DOE discretionary project for child outcomes, local Early Steps, and local school districts. The committee meets as needed to review progress data, effectiveness of implemented improvement strategies and recommend changes.

FFY 2013-2019 Targets were developed with input from the Early Steps Continuous Improvement Workgroup, the Florida Interagency Coordinating Council for Infants and Toddlers and Child and Family Outcomes Stakeholder Workgroup. The Child and Family Outcomes Workgroup established new business rules for reporting as described below.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A1	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A2	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A2	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B1	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B1	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B2	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B2	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C1	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C1	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C2	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C2	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1>=	XXX	XXX
Target A2>=	XXX	XXX
Target B1>=	XXX	XXX
Target B2>=	XXX	XXX
Target C1>=	XXX	XXX
Target C2>=	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

XXX

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

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Total
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX

	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	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
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	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

	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	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
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	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

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	XXX	XXX

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

	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	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
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	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Will your separate report be just the at-risk infants and toddlers or aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C?

At-risk infants and toddlers

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2012	Target>=	31.90%	33.00%	33.50%	35.00%	39.00%
A1	31.80%	Data	32.60%	30.87%	29.07%	29.12%	28.52%
A1 AR		Target>=					
A1 AR		Data					
A2	2012	Target>=	68.90%	69.00%	70.00%	72.00%	74.00%
A2	68.80%	Data	68.30%	66.95%	66.09%	67.67%	60.10%
A2 AR		Target>=					
A2 AR		Data					
B1	2012	Target>=	54.30%	56.50%	57.00%	57.50%	58.00%
B1	54.20%	Data	55.99%	53.06%	53.40%	53.18%	53.49%
B1 AR		Target>=					
B1 AR		Data					
B2	2012	Target>=	44.10%	45.00%	46.00%	47.00%	48.00%
B2	44.00%	Data	43.51%	43.48%	41.12%	40.95%	39.00%

B2 AR		Target >=					
B2 AR		Data					
C1	2012	Target >=	54.20%	55.00%	56.00%	57.00%	58.00%
C1	54.10%	Data	54.71%	54.50%	51.36%	52.44%	51.33%
C1 AR		Target >=					
C1 AR		Data					
C2	2012	Target >=	69.50%	69.60%	69.70%	69.80%	69.90%
C2	69.40%	Data	69.28%	68.09%	66.14%	67.60%	64.86%
C2 AR		Target >=					
C2 AR		Data					

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	44.00%	29.80%
Target A1 AR >=		
Target A2 >=	76.00%	55.20%
Target A2 AR >=		
Target B1 >=	60.00%	74.60%
Target B1 AR >=		
Target B2 >=	50.00%	51.00%
Target B2 AR >=		
Target C1 >=	60.00%	86.80%
Target C1 AR >=		
Target C2 >=	70.00%	89.10%
Target C2 AR >=		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

8,218

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

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	237	2.88%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	2,783	33.86%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	678	8.25%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	601	7.31%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,919	47.69%

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	0	0.00%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	30	100.00%

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	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	1,279	4,299	28.52%	44.00%	29.75%	Did Not Meet 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	4,520	8,218	60.10%	76.00%	55.00%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable

Florida's statewide slippage for Indicator A2 is believed to be a result if of the using the BDI-2 only. This tool does not allow the program to capture more sensitive incremental progress made by infants and toddlers in the social-emotional domain. Also, there are statewide inconsistencies in BDI-2 assessor trainings and fidelity due to limited access to certified trainers, inconsistent levels of trainer experience and expertise and lack of available refresher training.

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	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	0	0				N/A	N/A
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	30	30			100.00%	N/A	N/A

Provide reasons for A1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for A2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	59	0.72%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,608	19.57%

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,367	28.80%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,538	30.88%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,646	20.03%

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	0	0.00%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1	3.33%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	29	96.67%

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	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	4,905	6,572	53.49%	60.00%	74.63%	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	4,184	8,218	39.00%	50.00%	50.91%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	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	1	1			100.00%	N/A	N/A
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	30	30			100.00%	N/A	N/A

Provide reasons for B1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for B2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	36	0.44%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	417	5.07%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	447	5.44%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,519	30.65%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	4,799	58.40%

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	0	0.00%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	8	26.67%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	22	73.33%

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	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	2,966	3,419	51.33%	60.00%	86.75%	Met 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	7,318	8,218	64.86%	70.00%	89.05%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	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	8	8			100.00%	N/A	N/A
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	30	30			100.00%	N/A	N/A

Provide reasons for C1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for C2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

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	16,631
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.	5,815

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If the plan has changed, please provide sampling plan.	

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

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."

A standard score of 78 or above (>-1.5 SD) is considered to represent a level of functioning that is "comparable to same-aged peers."

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

The Early Steps State Office and the Florida Department of Education (DOE) have collaborated to develop an outcome measurement system for children birth to five years of age and have agreed to collect data on children across Part C and Part B on a common instrument, the BDI-2. The BDI-2 is a "standardized, individually administered assessment battery of key developmental skills in children from birth through seven years of age" [Source: Battelle Development Inventory – Examiner's Manual]. In addition to its use as a measure of child outcomes, this instrument may also be used for determination of eligibility for Early Steps. Florida's child outcomes measurement system uses scores from the Personal-Social domain of the BDI-2 to determine category placement for Indicator 3A, scores from the Cognitive and Communication domains of the BDI-2 to determine category placement for Indicator 3B, and scores from the Adaptive and Motor domains of the BDI-2 to determine category placement for Indicator 3C. The actual target data are derived from assessments administered upon entry into and exit from Early Steps for eligible children in all local Early Steps programs. Local program employees enter results for assessments in the BDI-2 Data Manager online scoring and reporting program. Data are exported from the Data Manager and a de-identified data file, consisting of all records with sufficient data to be included in the state report is sent to the University of Miami whose staff completes the analyses that produces the category assignments.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Department of Health and the Department of Education have collaborated to develop an outcome measurement system for children birth to five years of age and have agreed to collect data on children across Part C and Part B on a common instrument - the Battelle Developmental Inventory 2nd Edition (BDI-2). The BDI-2 is a "standardized, individually administered assessment battery of key developmental skills in children from birth through 7 years of age" [Source: Battelle Development Inventory – Examiner's Manual]. In addition to its use as a measure of child outcomes, this instrument may also be used for determination of eligibility for Early Steps.

Florida's child outcomes measurement system uses scores from all BDI-2 domains to report the following child outcomes to the Office of Special Education Programs:

- The Social Relationships (3A) outcome is reported using the BDI-2 Personal-Social domain;
- The Knowledge and Skills (3B) outcome is reported using the BDI-2 Communication or Cognitive domains, considering each domain when determining progress; and
- The Actions to Meet Needs (3C) outcome is reported using the BDI-2 Adaptive or Motor domains, considering each domain when determining progress.

There are four subdomains not administered on the BDI-2 prior to 24 months of age; therefore, for children under 24 months, we have imposed a raw score of zero at entry in the following subdomains:

- Adaptive – Personal Responsibility
- Personal-Social – Peer Interaction
- Motor – Perceptual Motor
- Cognitive – Reasoning and Academic Skills

The number of children in each of the progress reporting categories are calculated based on application of the following decision rules:

- Progress Category A: Percent of children who did not improve functioning:
 - Children who were functioning below a level comparable to same-aged peers at both entry and exit, and children who were functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers at entry but below their same-aged peers at exit.
 - Children that did not show any raw score gains between entry and exit in any of the subdomains that make up the domains used to measure the outcome (which rules out any standard score gain).
- Progress Category B: Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers:
 - Children who were functioning below a level comparable to same-aged peers at both entry and exit and showed a gain in their subdomain raw scores but did not reach a scale score of 5 at exit in any of the subdomains for BDI-II domains used to report an outcome.
 - Children who were functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers at entry but below their same-aged peers at exit and showed a gain in any subdomain raw score even with a subdomain scaled score of 5 or greater.
- Progress Category C: Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it:
 - Children functioning below a level comparable to same-aged peers at both entry and exit.
 - Children in this category showed a gain in their subdomain raw scores and either a scaled score of 5 or above in that domain or a DQ score gain for the corresponding domain.

- Progress Category D: Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers :
- This category includes only children who were functioning below a level comparable to same-aged peers on entry but were functioning comparable to same-age peers at exit.
- Children in this category showed a gain in their domain standard score for any of the domains used to report an outcome.
- Progress Category E: Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers:
- This category includes children who were functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers at both entry and exit for any of the domains used to report an outcome.

3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3 - OSEP Response

The State did not, as required by the measurement table, provide targets for FFY 2019.

3 - Required Actions

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	2005	Target >=	75.00%	75.50%	76.00%	76.50%	77.00%
A	55.90%	Data	85.49%	83.21%	82.20%	80.54%	83.96%
B	2005	Target >=	72.00%	72.50%	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%
B	52.50%	Data	83.49%	78.55%	79.19%	77.66%	81.17%
C	2005	Target >=	87.00%	87.50%	88.00%	88.50%	89.00%
C	57.60%	Data	91.51%	91.29%	90.95%	92.04%	92.05%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	77.50%	84.60%
Target B >=	74.50%	81.49%
Target C >=	89.50%	92.26%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

FFY 2013-2019 Targets were developed with input from the Early Steps Continuous Improvement Workgroup, the Florida Interagency Coordinating Council for Infants and Toddlers and Child and Family Outcomes Stakeholder Workgroup.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	2,595
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	1,383
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	1,170
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	1,383
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	1,127
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	1,383
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	1,276
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	1,383

	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)	83.96%	77.50%	84.60%	Met 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)	81.17%	74.50%	81.49%	Met 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)	92.05%	89.50%	92.26%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for part A slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for part B slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for part C slippage, if applicable

XXX

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If the plan has changed, please provide the sampling plan.	

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

	Yes / No
Was a collection tool used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised collection tool?	NO
If your collection tool has changed, upload it here	XXX
The demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.	YES

If not, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

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 family survey responses are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program. The following chart indicates race/ethnicity as reported in Child Count Settings data versus distribution of race/ethnicity in the survey response data.

Race/Ethnicity Family Survey Responses Child Count FY 2018-19
 American Indian or Alaska Native <1% .18%
 Asian 3% 1.91%
 Black or African American 16% 19.99%
 Hispanic/Latino 39% 39.16%

Muti-racial	3%	3.4%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	<1%	.07%
White	39%	35.3%
Missing	<1%	Not reported

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) survey was utilized as the measurement tool for Indicator 4. All families with children who had an initial IFSP for at least six months and exiting the program between February 1, 2019 and May 1, 2019 were offered the opportunity to submit a survey. The distribution process utilized personal contact with the families by the Service Coordinator, Family Resource Specialist and providers working with the child and family.

4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

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	2012	0.71%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	0.72%	0.72%	0.73%	0.73%	0.74%
Data	0.75%	0.70%	0.69%	0.70%	0.69%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	0.74%	0.74%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

FFY 2013-2019 Targets were developed with input from the Early Steps Continuous Improvement Workgroup and the Florida Interagency Coordinating Council for Infants and Toddlers.

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	1,583
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	222,040

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
1,583	222,040	0.69%	0.74%	0.71%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Compare your results to the national data

Florida's results are slightly lower than the statewide target and lower than the national average of 1.25%.

The Child Find Stakeholder Workgroup met several times during 2019. Two surveys were conducted and the workgroup developed recommendations based on surveys results. Recommendations are to develop a uniform referral form for referring partners to use statewide, develop a child find monitoring plan and ensure consistent messaging in public awareness materials.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

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	2012	1.89%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	1.90%	1.91%	1.91%	1.92%	1.92%
Data	2.04%	2.10%	1.98%	2.17%	2.29%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	1.93%	2.47%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

FFY 2013-2019 Targets were developed with input from the Early Steps Continuous Improvement Workgroup and the Florida Interagency Coordinating Council for Infants and Toddlers. As a result of the current data and the steady increases in the population being served, the State does not anticipate a decrease from 2.47%.

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	16,824
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	679,816

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
16,824	679,816	2.29%	1.93%	2.47%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Compare your results to the national data

Florida's results are higher than the statewide target of 1.93, but lower than the national average of 3.48%. The Child Find Stakeholder Workgroup met several times during 2019. Two surveys were conducted and the workgroup made recommendations based on surveys results. The recommendations are to develop a uniform referral form for referring partners to use statewide, develop a child find monitoring plan and ensure consistent messaging in public awareness materials.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

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	85.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	96.67%	77.50%	95.36%	96.13%	84.33%

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
240	330	84.33%	100%	90.30%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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.

58

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

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

All 15 local Early Steps programs are monitored annually. This year's monitoring utilized a review of child record documentation and data. The monitoring sample was comprised of randomly selected child records based on local program size. A total of 330 records were reviewed. Exceptional family circumstances included family schedule conflicts, child illness and unsuccessful attempts to contact the family.

State staff manually review each randomly selected file to determine if an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

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

XXX

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

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

A key factor impacting performance was local early steps program provider capacity. A few programs did not have adequate staff available to schedule initial evaluations with a multidisciplinary team within the 45-day timeline. This resulted in evaluations being scheduled late. The Early Steps State Office will continue to monitor and require recruitment of adequate number trained providers.

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
7	5	0	2

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

To ensure non-compliant practices have been revised and the local Early Steps programs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, the Early Steps State Office conducted subsequent reviews of child records for each local program with findings of non-compliance, the Early Steps State Office reviewed a subsequent sample of a total of 82 child records for the five seven programs. Five of the seven programs achieved 100% compliance based upon a subsequent review of records. Two of the Early Steps programs did not achieve 100% compliance on the subsequent reviews and have not yet corrected noncompliance. The record reviews verified correction of noncompliance of five of programs with findings. This was done by reviewing the referral and IFSP dates in the data system and verifying the information with the referral form and IFSP documents provided by the local Early Steps programs.

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

Forty-seven of 300 children did not receive an initial evaluation and assessment and a initial IFSP meeting conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. For each individual case of noncompliance, the Early Steps State Office verified that the local program conducted the evaluation and assessment and individualized Family Support Plan (IFSP) for each child, although late. The verification was based on follow up reporting and reviews by the local program with documentation of individual children whose evaluation and assessment and initial IFSP had not been completed.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Two of the Early Steps programs have not yet corrected noncompliance. These programs are still working with the Early Steps State Office on program and process improvement strategies.

As described in the introduction, the Early Steps State Office is developing a tiered system of support to assist programs to identify sustainable improvement strategies. The teams will be organized around a continuum of supports, including training, technical assistance, policies, and technology improvements to assist the local Early Steps programs in improving performance and compliance. Monthly updates will required until correction of noncompliance is achieved.

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

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

7 - OSEP Response

In the table under the "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017" the State reported that it identified seven findings of noncompliance. However, the State also reported in its narrative that "the Early Steps State Office reviewed a subsequent sample of a total of 82 records for the five programs". Because of this discrepancy OSEP is unable to determine the number of findings the State corrected in FFY 2017. Therefore, OSEP could not determine if the State ensured, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, that each EIS program or provider: (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.

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	64.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	93.70%	90.71%	93.57%	93.23%	91.00%

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

If no, please explain.

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
305	330	91.00%	100%	95.45%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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.

10

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

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

All 15 local Early Steps programs are monitored annually. This year's monitoring utilized a review of child record documentation and data. The monitoring sample was comprised of randomly selected child records based on local program size. A total of 330 records were reviewed. Exceptional family circumstances included family schedule conflicts, child illness and unsuccessful attempts to contact the family.

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

XXX

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

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

A key factor impacting performance was service coordinator error in scheduling timely conferences. The local program staff did track the due date in a timely manner which resulted in the transition conferences being late. The Early Steps State Office will continue to monitor and ensure adequate training is conducted and that best practices for transition are being followed.

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
8	6	0	2

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

To ensure non-compliant practices have been revised and the local Early Steps programs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, the Early Steps State Office conducted a subsequent review of child records for each of the eight local program with findings of noncompliance. The Early Steps State Office reviewed a subsequent sample of a total of 130 additional records for the eight programs. This review verified correction of noncompliance for six out of the eight programs with findings. Six of the eight programs achieved 100% compliance on the subsequent reviews. Two of the Early Steps programs did not achieve 100% compliance on the subsequent reviews and have not yet corrected noncompliance. The record reviews verified correction of noncompliance of six of programs with findings. This was done by reviewing a subsequent sample of IFSP records to ensure steps and services were provided within at least 90 days and not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday.

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

Twenty-seven of 300 children did not receive an IFSP with transition steps and services within at least 90 days and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday. The Early Steps State Office verified that that the local program developed an IFSP with

transition steps and services, although late, for twenty-four of the children. Three children were no longer enrolled in the program. This verification was based on follow up reporting and review of documentation provided by the local program.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Two of the Early Steps programs have not yet corrected noncompliance. These programs are still working with the Early Steps State Office on process improvement strategies.

The Early Steps State Office has developed and initiated a Transition training resource on the State's website for programs to utilize and review for transition moving forward. Additional plans include adding the training the State's main training administration system, so programs will have the ability to print of certificates of completion as well as place them in their competency folders at the program level to serve as on-going training. The Early Steps State Office will likewise refer this training to programs to implement and take if they receive significant non-compliance scores in this indicator.

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

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

8A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8A - 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 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.

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	88.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	86.62%	94.29%	85.56%	96.44%	95.29%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

YES

If no, please explain.

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
312	330	95.29%	100%	96.30%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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.

6

Describe the method used to collect these data

The data source for this Indicator comes from monitoring. All 15 local Early Steps programs are monitored annually. This year's monitoring utilized a review of child record documentation and data. The monitoring sample was comprised of randomly selected child records based on local program size. A total of 330 records were reviewed.

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 monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

All 15 local Early Steps programs are monitored annually for this indicator. This year's monitoring utilized a review of child record documentation and data.

The monitoring sample was comprised of randomly selected child records based on local program size.

A total of 330 records were reviewed.

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

XXX

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

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

A key factor impacting performance was due to a programmatic tracking system error. The local program staff did not track the due date in a timely manner which resulted in the notifications being sent late to the Local Education Agency and State Education Agency. Some programs struggle with timely notification when children enter the program very close to 90 days before the child's third birthday. The Early Steps State Office will continue to monitor and ensure adequate training is conducted on running reports for tracking due dates to ensure timely notification.

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
4	4	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

To ensure noncompliant practices have been revised and the local Early Steps programs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, the Early Steps State Office conducted a subsequent review of child records for each of the 4 local programs with findings of noncompliance. The Early Steps State Office reviewed a subsequent sample of 79 records for the four programs with findings. The four programs achieved 100% compliance on the subsequent reviews. This review verified correction of all four programs with findings. This was done by reviewing a subsequent sample of

notification lists sent to the Local Education Agency and State Education Agency and verifying the information was sent in a timely manner at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday.

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

Notification to the State Education Agency (SEA) and the Local Education Agency (LEA) where the toddler resides was late for fourteen of the 300. The Early Steps State Office verified that the local program provided notification to the State Education Agency (SEA) and the Local Education Agency (LEA) where the toddler resides, although late, for all fourteen toddlers. This verification was based on follow up reporting and review of documentation provided by the local program.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

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

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

8B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8B - 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 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.

The State did not provide the reasons for delay, as required by the measurement table.

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 = [(# 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.

8C - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	70.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	94.07%	91.43%	93.93%	93.53%	92.00%

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

If no, please explain.

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
306	330	92.00%	100%	95.76%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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.

0

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.

10

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

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

All 15 local Early Steps programs are monitored annually. This year's monitoring utilized a review of child record documentation and data. The monitoring sample was comprised of randomly selected child records based on local program size.

A total of 330 records were reviewed.

Exceptional family circumstances included family schedule conflicts, child illness and unsuccessful attempts to contact the family.

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

XXX

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

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

A key factor impacting performance was service coordinator error in scheduling timely conferences. The local program staff did track the due date in a timely manner which resulted in the transition conferences being late. The Early Steps State Office will continue to monitor and ensure adequate training is conducted and that best practices for transition are being followed.

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
7	5	0	2

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

To ensure non-compliant practices have been revised and the local Early Steps programs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, the Early Steps State Office conducted a subsequent review of child records for each of the seven local programs with findings of noncompliance. The Early Steps State Office reviewed a subsequent sample of a total of 76 additional records for the seven programs. This review verified correction of noncompliance for five of the seven programs with findings. Five of the seven programs achieved 100% compliance based upon the subsequent reviews. Two of the Early Steps programs did not achieve 100% on the subsequent reviews and have not yet corrected noncompliance. The record reviews verified correction of noncompliance of five of programs with findings. This was done by reviewing a subsequent sample of IFSP records to

ensure a transition conference was completed within at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday.

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

Twenty-four of 300 children did not receive a transition conference within at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday. The Early Steps State Office verified that the local program conducted a transition conference, although, late twenty-two children. Two children were no longer enrolled in the program. This verification was based on follow up reporting and review of documentation provided by the local program.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Two of the Early Steps programs have not yet corrected noncompliance. The programs are still working with the Early Steps State Office on program improvement.

The development of a tiered system of support by the Early Steps State Office will also assist programs to identify sustainable improvement strategies. The teams will be organized around a continuum of supports, including training, technical assistance, policies, and technology improvements to assist the local Early Steps programs in improving performance and compliance.

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

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

8C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8C - OSEP Response

The State has included conflicting statements in its narrative under "FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected". Specifically, the State reported "This review verified correction of five programs with findings. These record reviews verified correction of noncompliance of six of the eight programs with findings". Because of this discrepancy OSEP is unable to determine the number of findings the State verified as corrected in FFY 2017. As a result, OSEP could not determine if the State ensured, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, that each EIS program or provider 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.

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

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

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

Provide an explanation below.

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

XXX

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

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

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 (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

There were no hearings that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution settlement agreements.

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

9 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2018. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

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 EDFacts 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

Provide an explanation below

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

XXX

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	100.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target>=					
Data		50.00%			

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=		

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				N/A	N/A

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

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 (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

There were no agreements related to due process complaints, no mediation agreements not related to due process complaints and no mediations held.

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

10 - OSEP Response

The State did not provide targets through FFY 2019 for this indicator. The State must provide targets from the first year in which the State reported at least ten mediations through FFY 2019.

10 - Required Actions

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

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:

Renee Jenkins

Title:

IDEA Part C Coordinator

Email:

Renee.Jenkins@flhealth.gov

Phone:

850-245-4456

Submitted on:

04/28/20 1:07:51 PM