

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

The Department of Economic Security, Arizona Early Intervention Program (DES/AzEIP), acting as the Lead Agency under Part C of IDEA, gathered and synthesized information from multiple sources, including 618 data, agency data systems, monitoring data, and information from the complaint and dispute resolution process. As was the process in developing the Annual Performance Report, DES/AzEIP personnel reviewed and interpreted the available data to determine the status of the State's performance and compliance with specified indicators and the possible reasons for progress or slippage. Based on the data and its description, DES/AzEIP proposed measurable targets, where State determination was appropriate (i.e., performance indicators and not compliance indicators). In addition, DES/AzEIP proposed improvement activities, timelines, and resources that aligned with activities of the Arizona Compliance Agreement and extended into the period beyond the scope of the Compliance Agreement.

DES/AzEIP convened three stakeholder meetings in 2005 and presented data and information based on the preliminary drafts described above to each stakeholder group. DES/AzEIP's presentation focused on the statewide data, and, when available, local data, and the meaning of the data. For example, DES/AzEIP presented statewide and local data on Indicator 7 regarding the percent of eligible children with IFSPs for whom evaluation and assessment and an initial Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. DES/AzEIP presented data for both (a) evaluation and assessment and (b) the initial IFSP, and described how the data could be interpreted. After a brief summary of the State's current Compliance Agreement initiatives that impact compliance with the 45-day timeline, DES/AzEIP engaged stakeholders in a discussion of (a) the data, (b) the interpretation of the data, and (c) the improvement activities, timelines and resources, excluding Compliance Agreement activities, that would improve the State's compliance with each indicator. Input from the three stakeholder groups was documented during the meetings and incorporated into the State Performance Plan.

The composition of each stakeholder group determined the focus of each meeting. The first stakeholder group was composed primarily of (1) DES/AzEIP's contractors, who are responsible for the Initial Planning Process (IPP) and Program Coordination, (2) agency representatives from (a) the DES, Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD), (b) Arizona State Schools for the Deaf and the Blind (ASDB), and (c) the Arizona Department of Health Services, Office for Children with Special Health Care Needs (ADHS/OCSHCN). Because this group is involved with public awareness, child find, the initial evaluation and assessment, and, if eligible, the development of the initial IFSP, DES/AzEIP staff engaged this group in a discussion of Indicators 3 (child outcomes), 5 (percent of children, birth to one, with an IFSP), 6 (percent of children, birth to three, with an IFSP), and Indicator 7 (percent of infants and toddlers with an IFSP for whom evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within the 45-day timeline).

The second and third stakeholder groups were composed of (1) members of the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC); (2) DES/AzEIP's contracted Program Coordinators; (3) agency representatives from DDD, ASDB, ADHS/OCSHCN, and Arizona Department of Education (ADE); and (4) the public. Invitations to the second and third stakeholder groups were broadly distributed electronically to list serves for the ICC, its committees, agency partners, contractors and others who have requested notices regarding AzEIP and the ICC. The second stakeholder group focused on Indicators 1 (timely services), 7 (percent of infants and toddlers with an IFSP for whom evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within the 45-day timeline,) and 8 (transition). The third stakeholder group focused on Indicators 4 (family outcomes), and 9 (general supervision), which touched on compliance and performance for all of the other indicator areas.

DES/AzEIP also facilitated an early childhood outcomes task force in 2005 consisting of representatives from the IPP contractors, AzEIP Standards of Practice trainers, a higher education institute, ASDB, and DES/AzEIP, to make recommendations for Child Outcomes, Indicator #3. The

task force's preliminary recommendations were shared with the first stakeholder group and input incorporated into the plan.

During development of the FFY2005 APR in 2006 DES/AzEIP determined the necessity of revisions to the SPP, including timelines and activities in order to address slippage that had occurred on several indicators, and to ensure that future targets would be met. The actual target data was presented at a stakeholders meeting in January 2007. The stakeholder group was involved in discussions of new and revised improvement strategies.

DES/AzEIP will disseminate the SPP to the public via broad electronic distribution to its list serves for the ICC, its committees, agency partners, DES/AzEIP contractors, and others who have requested notices regarding AzEIP and the ICC. DES/AzEIP also will post the SPP to its website.

Indicator 1

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments

Indicator – 1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The family's Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) team (of which the family is a member) decides which supports and services are needed to make progress toward the desired outcomes. These supports and services are listed on the IFSP, along with the projected "start date" for each. The IFSP team designates the start date for each service to reflect the priorities of the family and their need for support in attaining the identified IFSP outcomes, as well as the roles of each team member in supporting each other and the family. As a result, start dates may be staggered over the period for which the IFSP is established. The service coordinator is responsible for accessing the early intervention services identified on the IFSP. AzEIP service coordinators obtain services through their agencies' network of providers, which can include employees or contractors and through a family's health plan.

During the 2004-2005 reporting period and monitoring cycle, AzEIP's Child File Audit Guidance documents defined "timely" as beginning "very close to the start date on the IFSP". AzEIP rated a program noncompliant if any of the early intervention services listed on the IFSP were not provided in a timely manner. Baseline data collected during the period reflected that standard and measure.

The monitoring process used by AzEIP for the 2005-2006 reporting year reflected implementation of a consistent definition of "timely". Services were considered timely if they began on or before the service start date on the IFSP. Arizona continued to use the standard that if any service on a child's IFSP was not started in a timely manner, the file was counted noncompliant on this indicator. Reasons for service delay were not documented during this monitoring cycle because OSEP guidance on collecting reason data was issued after completion of the monitoring cycle.

Site visits conducted during the 2005-2006 reporting period and subsequent years will be based on a revised child file audit tool that a) reflects the approved standard for determining if a service is timely,

b) will collect timeliness data by service, and c) will account for reasons for delay in service delivery. Individual services will be considered timely if they begin within 45 days of parent consent of the Individualized Family Service Plan, or by the planned start date for the service if that planned date is greater than 45 days from IFSP consent. AzEIP will continue to consider a child’s file out of compliance on this indicator if any early intervention service is not provided in accordance with the timely standard.

Programs will also report timely service data in their program self-assessment process, but that data will not be used to report compliance for the purpose of this indicator.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

2004-2005 Baseline data related to services are provided in accordance with start date on IFSP:

Year	2004-2005
Data Source	Cycle 2 Site Visits
Number of IFSPs reviewed	168
# who receive services in a timely manner	81
Percent	48%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Data from Cycle 2 onsite monitoring visits is the source of the baseline data for this indicator. A complete description of AzEIP’s Continuous Quality Improvement and Monitoring System (CQIMS) is found in the overview of Indicator 9. During the first year of on-site monitoring visits, the monitors found a large number of IFSPs in which the planned start date for all services was the same date as the IFSP signature date. To take this error into consideration, the monitors made a determination of “timely” if there was documentation in the child’s file that all services were provided within 30 days of the “start date” listed on the IFSP. Subsequently, guidance and technical assistance were provided to service coordinators to clarify the difference between IFSP signature date and service start dates. Beginning with the 2005-2006 monitoring year services are considered timely only if they meet the approved definition of timely.

The original on-site process did not differentiate the timeliness of each service listed for a child, but rather evaluated if all IFSP services were provided in a timely manner. If any service listed on the IFSP was not started in a timely manner, the entire item was considered noncompliant. In addition, AzEIP did not document mitigating factors, such as child illness or cancellations by family members.

Other contributing factors influencing the identified non-compliance during the baseline period include: (1) many service coordination agencies did not have a mechanism in place to track and document when a service actually began; (2) the onsite reviewers often found that the “start date” listed on the IFSP was the same date as the IFSP meeting, not the anticipated start date for the service; and (3) statewide capacity issues for ongoing therapy, as service coordinators struggle to locate providers for families.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	60%

2006 (2006-2007)	65%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%
2011 (2011-2012)	100%
2012 (2012-2013)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Resources
Expand implementation of the team-based model and participation-based practices.	Ongoing	DES/AzEIP staff, TAMS, Agency partners, and early intervention providers.
Revise and Implement the AzEIP Family	July 2011	DES/AzEIP staff, agency partners
Use Survey data to identify strengths, limitations and opportunities for improvement.	July 2012	DES/AzEIP staff, Agency partners, and TAMS,

<p>Provide targeted and general technical assistance through regional meetings, on-site and phone meetings with TAMS and/or DES/AzEIP staff, written guidance/clarification and other strategies. Technical assistance will address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Family Rights • Transition • Team-based early intervention • Child and Family Assessment • Service Coordination • Financial Matters, including FCP, Medicaid, private insurance • Child Indicators/ Child Indicator Summary Forms • Data Collection and Reporting Requirements 	<p>July 2012 and ongoing</p>	<p>DES/AzEIP staff, and Technical Assistance and Monitoring Specialists</p>
<p>Identify the reasons that early intervention professionals, by discipline and geographic area, decide to remain in or leave the field of early intervention.</p>	<p>January 2012, January 2013</p>	<p>CSPD Coordinator, Agency Partners, ICC Collaboration and Education Committee, and AzEIP TAMS</p>
<p>Enhance and coordinate recruitment and retention with potential partners, such as ADE, First Things First, Therapy Boards and Associations, etc.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>DES/AzEIP and its agency partners, ICC, FTF staff, Therapy Board members</p>
<p>Partner with the universities to present and/or make available information about functional, participation-based early intervention and service coordination, and employment opportunities to students.</p>	<p>July 2010 and Ongoing</p>	<p>CSPD Coordinator, Agency Partners, and AzEIP TAMS</p>
<p>Develop a web-based data system to manage child and family, professional, contractual, and general supervision data.</p>	<p>December 2013</p>	<p>DES/AzEIP, DES Division of Technology Services</p>
<p>Develop and implement follow-up strategies to ensure correct and consistent application of the policies and practices that were the subject of the training, and technical assistance.</p>	<p>December 2012</p>	<p>DES/AzEIP and its agency partners, and TAMS</p>

<p>Strengthen child and family assessment practices to ensure that assessment yields meaningful information about family priorities, interests, and desired outcomes and child assessment is contextualized by the routines, activities, and relationships that are a natural part of the child's life.</p>	<p>December 2012</p>	<p>DES/AzEIP and its agency partners, Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC), TAMS, Raising Special Kids, early intervention professionals</p>
<p>Incorporated herein are the improvement activities from; (i) Indicator 2 regarding the AzEIP Standards of Practice; (ii) Indicator 9 regarding evaluating and revising General Supervision policies, procedures, tools and forms,(ii) using root cause analysis, and (iii) enforcement and sanctions, and; (iv) Indicator 14 regarding data management, editing and validation, and analysis.</p>		<p>DES/AzEIP and its agency partners, ICC, TAMS, early intervention professionals</p>

Indicator 2

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: Described in Indicator 1.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments

Indicator – 2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.

Measurement: Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Historically, the legal requirement for natural environments and the reasoning behind the requirement was not well understood by the early intervention community. Technical assistance, training, policy clarification, and contract changes in the years since AzEIP began, have resulted in a steady shift in service settings, away from settings where only children with disabilities participate, to settings such as the home, park, child care facilities, and other community places.

The AzEIP Standards of Practice, required of all service providers in early intervention since 2001, embeds the philosophy of providing families supports and services in natural environments throughout the knowledge and skills components. The Standards of Practice helps practitioners understand the importance of learning a family’s routines and activities, so they can identify the natural learning opportunities available to children throughout their daily activities.

The AzEIP IFSP Guidance Document describes the federal requirements, philosophical tenets, and practice guidelines for providing services in natural environments. The statewide IFSP form provides a structure and format for developing IFSPs in alignment with the requirements and intent of the law.

Through its Continuous Monitoring and Quality Improvement System, described fully in Indicator 9, AzEIP monitors programs’ compliance with the natural environment requirement. Both program self-assessments and on-site monitoring visits reinforce the requirements and philosophy behind providing services to families and children in natural environments.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

618 Table 2	2004
Percentage of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.	86%
Setting- “Other”, including parks, libraries and community centers.	11%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

As of December 1, 2004, 618 Settings data indicate that home and programs designed for typically developing children and other settings are identified as the setting of the predominant service for 97% of children receiving Part C services. Fewer than 3% of children are receiving their predominant services in a non-natural environment. The percentage of children served in the home, programs for

Part C SPP 2005-2012

Arizona

typically developing children, and other community settings increased from 62% to 85% between 1999 and 2002 and has remained steady since that time.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	86%
2006 (2006-2007)	86%
2007 (2007-2008)	88%
2008 (2008-2009)	90%
2009 (2009-2010)	92%
2010 (2010-2011)	94%
2011 (2011-2012)	87%
2012 (2012-2013)	88%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Continued implementation of the AzEIP Standards of Practice for early intervention professionals to support understanding of early intervention in natural environments.	December 2005 with annual trainings and ongoing test options	CSPD Coordinator, ASDTP
Provide targeted and general technical assistance through regional meetings, on-site and phone meetings with TAMS and/or DES/AzEIP staff, written guidance/clarification and other strategies.	June 2011 and ongoing	DES/AzEIP staff, TAMS and agency
Work with Data Accountability Center to review data collection and reporting.	January-June 2008	Data Accountability Center has agreed to provide TA.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Implement data editing and validations processes in order to identify unusual findings in a timely manner, including regular review/monitoring of program/public agencies' practices in collecting, editing and reporting data.	July 2010 – July 2012	DES/AzEIP Staff , Agency Partners, DAC
Implement system management and documentation procedures to ensure collection and reporting of accurate and timely data, including data collection, editing and validation, and reporting.	July 2010 – July 2012	DES/AzEIP Staff , Agency Partners,
Incorporated herein are the improvement activities from: (i) Indicator 1 regarding expansion of the team-based model and functional, participation-based practices; (ii) Indicator 1 regarding recruitment and retention; (iii) Indicator 1 regarding development of a web-based data system; (iv) Indicator 1 regarding child and family assessment practices; and (v) Indicator 1 regarding follow-up strategies to ensure correct application of policies and procedures. (vi) Indicator 9 regarding revising and implementing General Supervision policies, procedures, tools and forms, root cause analysis, and enforcement and sanctions; and (vii) Indicator 14 regarding data management, editing and validation, and analysis.		DES/AzEIP Staff , Agency Partners, Technical Assistance and Monitoring Specialists, the ICC and contractors

Indicator 3**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

DES/AzEIP used progress data from the reporting period to prepare its response for this indicator. The progress data were presented at a stakeholders' meeting on November 14, 2008 at which time improvement activities completed and to be completed were discussed.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments

Indicator – 3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

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

Measurement:**A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):**

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

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

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

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.

functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

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

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

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

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Arizona adopted the Early Childhood Outcomes Center's (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form and renamed it the Child Indicator Summary Form (CISF). Minor adaptations were made to the form to capture necessary demographic information, combine data tables, and change the ratings from numbers to letters so children would not be rated a high or low number. (The letters spell the word "TEAMING" in English and "EQUIPOS" in Spanish.) The following is the State's description of its process:

Beginning June 15, 2006, Child Indicator Summary Entry Forms were completed for infants and toddlers who are (i) referred after age 2.6 years or younger, (ii) eligible for AzEIP, and (iii) interested in early intervention. On December 15, 2006, programs began collecting exit data. Exit data is collected for children who exit early intervention after at least six months in early intervention, regardless of the exit

reason. The exit rating is determined no earlier than 90 days prior to the child’s exit from early intervention.

The child’s IFSP team, which includes the family, uses the CISF to summarize data from a variety of sources, including parent report, observation, a broad spectrum tool, other evaluation results, and available records. Arizona has approved certain broad spectrum tools that (i) ensure all areas of development are assessed, and (ii) have been, or are in the process of being, cross-walked by the ECO Center. Programs may choose any tool on the following list:

- The Ounce Scale
- Battelle Developmental Inventory, Second Edition
- Bayley Scales of Infant Development, Third Edition
- Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development, Second Edition
- Carolina Curriculum for Infants and Toddlers with Special Needs, Third Edition
- Developmental Assessment of Young Children
- Early Learning Accomplishment Profile
- Hawaii Early Learning Profile
- Infant -Toddler Developmental Assessment Record with Provence Birth-to-Three Developmental Profile
- Michigan Early Intervention Developmental Profile, Revised, Vol. 1 and 2
- The Oregon Project for Visually Impaired and Blind Preschool Children Skills Inventory, Sixth Edition

All AzEIP service providing agencies send completed entry and exit CISFs to DES/AzEIP monthly via mail, fax, or e-mail. DES/AzEIP created a database for the child outcomes data, and data is entered by DES/AzEIP staff.

The DES/AzEIP database has been programmed using the ECO Center algorithms to calculate child progress. That database links to current data systems of the AzEIP service-providing agencies, to ensure necessary demographic information is captured. The largest AzEIP service providing agency, the Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD), revised its database (FOCUS) to capture the child indicator data. DDD service coordinators enter the data into FOCUS, and DES/AzEIP receives FOCUS data on a monthly basis. For FFY 2007, DES/AzEIP extracted data from FOCUS and entered it into the child outcomes database. Using database information, the child’s entry ratings are matched to the exit ratings and progress data is calculated using the algorithms.

DES/AzEIP’s definition for “comparable to same-aged peers” is a child who has been scored “E” or “T” on the child indicator form, which equates to the ECO Center’s 6 or 7.

Progress Data for FFY 2007:

DES/AzEIP will submit baseline data in February 2010.

The second year of progress data for children exiting in 2007-2008 is presented in the tables below.

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning.	19	5%
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	101	25%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach a level comparable to same-aged	81	20%

peers.		
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	80	20%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	117	29%
Total	N= 398	

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning.	20	5%
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	91	23%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	100	25%
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	110	28%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	77	19%
Total	N= 398	

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning.	24	6%
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	102	26%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	81	20%

d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	130	33%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	61	15%
Total	N= 398	

Discussion of Progress Data:

The progress data reported above is for children who entered the program after June 15, 2006 and exited during FFY 2007. During FFY 2007, there were 398 children for whom both entry and exit data were available. This is an increase from FFY 2006, when there were 22 children. Progress data was received from 13 out of the 15 counties. A review of the exit forms revealed that two programs were inaccurately determining whether a child had shown any improvement (the yes/no question on the CISF) based on a comparison of the ratings only. Specific technical assistance has been provided, however, this error is reflected in the above progress data.

DES/AzEIP captured data for 2,770 entry ratings during the reporting period from all counties. This is an increase from the 2,495 entry ratings that were captured in FFY 2006. DES/AzEIP reviewed the forms sent to the office and analyzed the data by county and program to determine potential causes for the low progress data compared to the number of entry forms from the last two years. Those causes include:

- (1) not all children remain in the program for at least 6 months;
- (2) there were children who left the program without notice and for whom there was not a current (within 6 months) assessment using the required tool; and
- (3) there were a number of programs for whom forms were not received and/or inconsistently submitted.

To address No. 3 above, in September 2008, DES/AzEIP implemented the following to increase both the quantity of forms (completed and sent to DES/AzEIP) and the quality of the assessment:

- (1) An AzEIP Alert with summary of the requirements for the child indicators was sent to program administrators, supervisors, and service coordinators.
- (2) Specific efforts were made in two counties to pull old files and record entry and exit data for FFY 2007.
- (3) The TAMS began review of forms on at least a quarterly basis for quality assurance and, as needed, to schedule TA with programs/agencies to: (i) discuss general procedures for completing and submitting child indicator forms; and (ii) review returned, incomplete forms.

In accordance with its improvement activities, DES/AzEIP disseminated statewide entry and exit data to programs with the TAMS supporting the programs to analyze the data and providing technical assistance to improve outcomes and the quantity of forms, as needed.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	<i>NA for this reporting period. Targets will be set in 2010.</i>

2006 (2006-2007)	<i>NA for this reporting period. Targets will be set in 2010.</i>			
2007 (2007-2008)	<i>NA for this reporting period. Targets will be set in 2010.</i>			
2008 (2008-2009)	<i>NA for this reporting period. Targets will be set in 2010.</i>			
Summary Statements	Targets for FFY 2009 (% of children)	Targets for FFY 2010 (% of children)	Targets for FFY 2011 (% of children)	Targets for FFY 2012 (% of children)
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)				
1. 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	62%	63%	64%	65%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	57%	57.5%	58%	58.5%
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)				
1. 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	71%	72%	73%	74%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	49%	49.5%	50%	50.5%
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs				
1. 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	71%	72%	73%	74%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	52%	52.5%	53%	53.5%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
In collaboration with staff from the ECO Center, DES/AzEIP provided Child Outcomes Trainings for AzEIP IPP contractors and service-providing agencies involved in the collection of entry data.	May 2006	DES/AzEIP Staff and ECO Center
Telephone conference with staff from the ECO Center, to address issues and concerns as programs began to use the tools and forms.	September 2006	DES/AzEIP Staff and ECO Center
An iTV (interactive instructional TV) training for all agencies involved in the on-going services to children who would be involved in exit ratings.	November 2006	DES/AzEIP Staff, Technical Assistance & Monitoring Specialists and ECO Center
Training for approximately 60 service coordinators in Maricopa County.	December 2006	DES/AzEIP Staff, Technical Assistance & Monitoring Specialists and ECO Center
Onsite monitoring visits for Cycle 4 (Pinal, Gila, Graham, Greenlee, and Cochise Counties) was provided on the child indicator forms and process. Non-compliance was included in the program's Correction Action Plan.	March – May 2007	DES/AzEIP Staff, Agency Partners & Technical Assistance & Monitoring Specialists
DES/AzEIP developed a new database to calculate the measurements required for this Indicator. DES/AzEIP Staff enters the child's I.D. from the CISF sent to the office and the field is populated with demographic information from AzEIP's ACTS database. The entry ratings are then entered into the database. When entering an exit rating, the exit rating is matched to the entry rating, allowing progress data to be calculated.	June 2006 – December 2006	DES/AzEIP Staff
DES/AzEIP published for public comment and thereafter revised its monitoring policy to incorporate the child indicators into its policies and procedures. In addition, new contracts procured from DES/AzEIP will expressly include the procedures for completing the CISF.	April 2007	DES/AzEIP Staff
Regional TAMS provided support on the child	August – December	DES/AzEIP Staff, Technical Assistance &

Part C SPP 2005-2012

Arizona

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
indicators in Yuma and on the Navajo Nation.	2007	Monitoring Specialists
DES/AzEIP will develop a mechanism to match the exit ratings for children entered in DDD's FOCUS with the entry rating that was entered into DES/AzEIP child indicator database.	May – December 2008	DES/AzEIP Staff
DES/AzEIP will conduct a regular review of the data, at least biannually, to identify needed technical assistance. DES/AzEIP will compare the number of eligible children with the number of data entry forms it receives and the number of children exiting the program with the number of exit forms it receives.	December 2007 - 2010	DES/AzEIP Staff
DES/AzEIP to review policies and procedures and circulate for public comment proposed changes to expand description of purpose and process for child and family outcomes.	July 2009 — July 2010	DES/AzEIP Staff
Engage public in discussion of revision to IFSP as reminder to complete entry/exit forms:	April - July 2009	DES/AzEIP Staff
DES/AzEIP to review policies and procedures and circulate for public comment proposed changes to expand description of purpose and process for child and family outcomes.	July 2009 – July 2010	DES/AzEIP Staff
During annual review of forms, revise IFSP to include reminder for child indicator completion.	April - July 2009	DES/AzEIP Staff
Develop a web-based data system to manage child and family, professional, contractual, and general supervision data.	December 2013	DES/AzEIP, DES Division of Technology Services
Strengthen child and family assessment practices to ensure that assessment yields meaningful information about family priorities, interests, and desired outcomes and child assessment is contextualized by the routines, activities, and relationships that are a natural part of the child's life.	December 2012	DES/AzEIP and its agency partners, ICC, TAMS, Raising Special Kids, early intervention professionals
Develop and implement follow-up strategies to ensure correct and consistent application of the policies and practices that were the subject of the training and technical assistance.	December 2012	DES/AzEIP and its agency partners, ICC, TAMS, Raising Special Kids, early intervention professionals
Incorporated herein is the improvement activity from Indicator 1 regarding targeted technical	July 2012 and	DES/AzEIP staff and Technical Assistance and

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
assistance and training.	ongoing	Monitoring Specialists

Indicator 4

NEW INDICATOR

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments

Indicator – 4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

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

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Overview: DES/AzEIP reviewed the surveys created by the National Center for Special Education Accountability and Monitoring (NCSEAM) and the Early Childhood Outcomes Center. Based upon feedback from the early intervention community suggesting a one-page survey, as well as the potential for collaboration with Part B, DES/AzEIP proposed use of the NCSEAM survey. After input at its stakeholder meeting held in November 2005, DES/AzEIP decided to use the NCSEAM survey section entitled “Impact of Early Intervention Services on Your Family” for this indicator.

DES/AzEIP discussed the survey and instructions, obtaining input from stakeholders at a statewide meeting in January 2006. In March 2006, at another statewide meeting, the finalized survey and

instructions were shared and discussed. In March 2006, DES/AzEIP disseminated the survey with instructions via e-mail for implementation on April 1, 2006.

The average score, recommended target data, and improvement activities were provided to a group of stakeholders and the ICC in January 2007 for input.

Description of Process:

1. The service coordinator is responsible for explaining the survey to the family in a way that is meaningful and reflective of the value of the family’s input. Explaining the survey includes sharing with the family that the survey is important for DES/AzEIP and AzEIP providers to know how the system is working and what improvements are needed.
2. To ensure that all families have the opportunity to respond to the survey, the service coordinator must make efforts to provide the survey to the family, in the family’s native language or other mode of communication. Written surveys are currently available in English and Spanish.
3. Prior to giving the family a survey, the service coordinator is responsible for completing the demographic information section at the top of the survey and reviewing this information with the family to make sure it is accurate. The family should complete “Date Completed” at the time the survey is completed.
4. The service coordinator is responsible for asking the family if they would like help completing the survey. Suggestions for those who might help the family include the service coordinator, other personnel within the agency, a service provider, the local program coordinator, and/or a family advocate.
5. The service coordinator will ensure the family is given the survey at the end of the annual IFSP and/or at the last meeting with the family prior to exiting early intervention.
6. A preprinted postage-paid envelope with the DES/AzEIP return address is provided to families with each survey.

DES/AzEIP created a database for the data from the family surveys. Surveys are received at the DES/AzEIP office and all information (demographic and ratings) are entered into the database. The database allows DES/AzEIP to run reports by program, county, ethnicity, and age of child at time of survey completion.

Due to the implementation date for the survey (April 2006), DES/AzEIP received a small number of surveys for FFY 2005. DES/AzEIP changed its reporting period by expanding the date until October 2006 in order to collect and analyze a larger number of surveys to better represent the population the State serves.

DES/AzEIP will revisit discussions with the Arizona Department of Education to determine whether utilization of their online survey database is feasible at some future date. DES/AzEIP will also include an improvement activity to explore other online survey possibilities.

In Federal Fiscal Year 2012, DES/AzEIP and the AzEIP community will implement a new family survey for the collection of family outcome data. The new survey was developed as a collaborative effort between DES/AzEIP staff, the ICC’s Collaboration and Education Committee, the Family Rights Workgroup, with input from families, family education, support and advocacy organizations, and early intervention professionals.

Baseline Data FFY 2006:

The percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped their family:

A. Know their rights - 94%

Count	18	2	7	101	108	215
--------------	----	---	---	-----	-----	-----

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	6
Description of Rating	Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree

B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs - 95%

Count	17	0	5	120	114	183
Rating	1	2	3	4	5	6
Description of Rating	Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree

C. Help their children develop and learn - 96%

Count	17	0	2	91	114	223
Rating	1	2	3	4	5	6
Description of Rating	Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree

The percent reported as baseline data for each of the sub-indicators is the percent of families with a score greater than or equal to 4, “agree.”

Discussion of Data:

The dissemination of surveys at the annual IFSP is monitored through onsite monitoring. For Cycle 4 monitoring, which occurred during the reporting period, 80% of the files reviewed (24/30) demonstrated the dissemination of the family survey at the annual IFSP. The non-compliance was included in the Corrective Action Plan for the agency with non-compliance and correction of the identified area will continue to be monitored.

DES/AzEIP is not currently able to compare the number of surveys received with the number of surveys disseminated as it does not capture census data on annual IFSPs, when the survey is disseminated.

DES/AzEIP analyzed the surveys by county, ethnicity, and age of the children for whom surveys were received to determine whether the data received was representative of the children it served. That comparison is set out below:

<u>Ethnicity:</u>	<u>618 Data (12/01/06)</u>	<u>AZ Survey Data</u>
American Indian	7.51%	3.16%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.62%	1.58%
Black or African American	4.62%	3.16%
Hispanic or Latino	38.46%	28.69%
White	47.78%	63.17%
<u>Age:</u>	<u>618 Data (12/01/06)</u>	<u>AZ Survey Data</u>
0-1	11.10%	5.7%
1-2	30.99%	37.7%
2-3	57.92%	56.5%

Part C SPP 2005-2012

Arizona

Using a sampling error of 4%, the surveys received appear to: (i) represent the approximate population served for American Indian, Asian or Pacific Islander, and Black or African American; (ii) under-represent the Hispanic or Latino population; and (iii) over-represent the Caucasian population. However, given the single digit percentages for the American Indian population, and using the 4% sampling error rate, the surveys are likely not representative of the American Indian population served in Arizona. DES/AzEIP's improvement activities include monitoring the representation throughout the year, and will focus technical activities to utilize the new Family Technical Assistance and Monitoring Specialist, who is bilingual, to reach out to the Hispanic community to increase family participation in the survey.

The surveys represent the children served ages 2-3 but not the 0 -1 or 1-2 population. Given that the surveys are first disseminated at the annual IFSP, the earliest a family would receive a survey would be when the child is one year old, and that would only be for children who were referred at birth. Therefore, the 0-1% will not match the 0-1 served for the State. DES/AzEIP will monitor the percentage for 0-2 throughout the year to determine whether more focused surveying is required.

As to geographic representation, DES/AzEIP received surveys from families in 13 out of the 15 counties in Arizona. The two counties from which surveys were not received, Greenlee and LaPaz, are rural counties and serve .02% and .5% respectively, of the children statewide. Greenlee County was included in the onsite monitoring this year and was in 100% compliance for dissemination of the family survey. LaPaz was not in the monitoring cycle; however, follow-up and technical assistance through DES/AzEIP were provided.

Copies of Arizona's survey in English and in Spanish are provided with this report.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	N/A
2006 (2006-2007)	A. Know their rights – 90% B. Effectively communicate their children's needs – 90% C. Help their children develop and learn – 90%
2007 (2007-2008)	.5% above baseline
2008 (2008-2009)	1% above baseline
2009 (2009-2010)	1.5% above baseline
2010 (2010-2011)	3% above baseline

2011 (2011-2012)	3% above baseline
2012 (2012-2013)	3% above baseline

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Revise IFSP form to include requirement for service coordinators to explain and disseminate family survey to families at each annual IFSP.	January 2007	CQI Coordinators, TA Specialist, CSPD Coordinator and TAMS
Revise Child File Audit to align with requirement to disseminate family survey at each annual IFSP and at or near transition.	March 2007	CQI Coordinators and TAMS
Include requirement to disseminate family survey at or near exit on exit checklist for service coordinators.	March 2008	CQI Coordinators and TAMS
During annual review of forms, revise IFSP Transition pages to include reminder for family survey dissemination at exit.	July 2009	DES/AzEIP Staff
DES/AzEIP to review policies and procedures and circulate for public comment proposed changes to expand description of purpose and process for child and family outcomes to support family engagement.	July 2009 – July 2010	DES/AzEIP Staff
Develop a web-based data system to manage child and family, professional, contractual and general supervision data.	December 2013	DES/AzEIP, DES Division of Technology Services
Strengthen child and family assessment practices to ensure that assessment yields meaningful information about family priorities, interests, and desired outcomes and child assessment is contextualized by the routines, activities, and relationships that are a natural part of the child's life.	December 2012	DES/AzEIP and its agency partners, ICC, TAMS, Raising Special Kids, early intervention professionals
Develop and implement follow-up strategies to ensure correct and consistent application of the	December 2012	DES/AzEIP and its agency partners,

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
policies and practices that were the subject of the training and technical assistance.		ICC, TAMS, Raising Special Kids, early intervention professionals
Incorporated herein is the improvement activity from Indicator 1 regarding targeted technical assistance and training.	July 2012 and ongoing	DES/AzEIP and its agency partners, ICC, TAMS, Raising Special Kids, early intervention professionals
Complete revision of and provide training and technical assistance on new Family Rights Handbook	June 2013	DES/AzEIP staff, ICC and its Committees, community partners
Revise AzEIP Family Survey	Summer 2012	DES/AzEIP staff, ICC and its Committees, community partners, NECTAC

Indicator 5

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: Described in Indicator 1.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision / Child Find

Indicator – 5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to:

- A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and**
- B. National data.**

Measurement:

A. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to the same percent calculated for other States with similar (narrow, moderate or broad) eligibility definitions.

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Arizona utilizes a comprehensive and coordinated system of public awareness and child find efforts to locate, identify, and evaluate all potentially eligible children. Public awareness efforts are directed

toward education, health and human service agencies (including agencies serving homeless children and families), tribes and tribal organizations, physicians, hospitals, and other health care providers, families, and child protective services workers. Coordinated efforts include broad dissemination of information, presentation to and training of referral sources, joint child find activities with schools and health care and social service agencies, an online referral system, interagency agreements, and memoranda of understanding.

DES/AzEIP monitors its Child Find and Public Awareness activities through the Program Self-Assessments completed by agencies and programs each year and the on-site monitoring visits. In addition, the local program coordinators, contracted to implement AzEIP's Child Find and Public Awareness Plan, submit monthly reports documenting their activities, as well as, annual summary reports, all of which are monitored and evaluated on an ongoing basis by DES/AzEIP.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

A. Comparison to other states with narrow eligibility requirements:

Rank	State	Percentage of infants under 1
1	Idaho	1.75%
2	North Dakota	1.58%
3	Oklahoma	1.35%
4	Montana	1.33%
5	District of Columbia	1.23%
6	Guam	1.13%
7	Connecticut	.93%
8	South Carolina	.78%
9	Oregon	.74%
10	Tennessee	.73%
11	Utah	.66%
12	Maine	.65%
13	Nebraska	.64%
14	Arizona	.59%
15	Georgia	.48%
16	Nevada	.47%

B. Arizona's national rankings with regard to number and percentage of infants birth to 1 receiving early intervention services:

2004	Baseline
National	.92%
Arizona	.61%

Discussion of Baseline Data: The percentage of infants birth to 1 has increased slowly but steadily from .50% in 2001 to .60% in 2004. In previous years, child find efforts focused on encouraging the referral of children under one year of age, and this had a small impact on the percentage of infants served. Analysis of referral data for October 2003 through June 2005 reveals that infants and young toddlers are being referred to AzEIP in substantial numbers and comprise a full 1/3 of all referrals to AzEIP during that period. Despite the large number of infants 0-1 referred to AzEIP, the percent of the population served on Dec.1, 2004 was .61% as compared to 1.54% of children 0-3. Anecdotal evidence suggests that evaluation teams need technical assistance to develop strategies and expertise in evaluating children under the age of 6 months in relation to Arizona's narrow eligibility definition and to develop strategies for serving very young infants.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	.63% of infants birth to 1 with IFSPs receiving early intervention services on Dec. 1
2006 (2006-2007)	.67% of infants birth to 1 with IFSPs receiving early intervention services on Dec. 1
2007 (2007-2008)	.70% of infants birth to 1 with IFSPs receiving early intervention services on Dec. 1
2008 (2008-2009)	.74% of infants birth to 1 with IFSPs receiving early intervention services on Dec. 1
2009 (2009-2010)	.77% of infants birth to 1 with IFSPs receiving early intervention services on Dec. 1
2010 (2010-2011)	.80% of infants birth to 1 with IFSPs receiving early intervention services on Dec. 1
2011 (2011-2012)	.62% of infants birth to 1 with IFSPs receiving early intervention services on Dec. 1
2012 (2012-2013)	.63% of infants birth to 1 with IFSPs receiving early intervention services on Dec. 1

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Improvement strategies to support Child Find and service provision to infants 0-1.		
Collect, analyze and utilize public awareness and child find data (e.g., referral source data, child demographics, public awareness materials) to	December 2010 - June 2012	DES/AzEIP staff, TAMS and DES Division of Technology Services Staff
Research strategies utilized by states with similar eligibility criteria for evaluating and assessing infants birth to 1.	July 2007	Technical Assistance and Monitoring Specialists (TAMS),

Part C SPP 2005-2012

Arizona

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
		DES/AzEIP Staff
Implement evaluation strategies identified through research.	September 2007	Local Program Coordinators, Technical & Assistance Monitoring Specialists, DES/AzEIP Staff
Identify resources for providers related to evaluation and services for premature infants and children exposed to substances.	January 2007	DES/AzEIP Staff, Technical & Assistance Monitoring Specialists
Develop and/or strengthen collaboration between AzEIP child find system and regional hospital Newborn Intensive Care system, including Newborn Intensive Care Units (NICUs), Newborn Follow-up, Healthy Steps, and related programs.	July 2007 through December 2008	DES/AzEIP Staff, Technical Assistance and Monitoring Specialists, Local Program Coordinators, local Initial Planning Process contractors.
Conduct further drill-down of data, following up on questions and hypotheses that emerged from data analysis conducted 2005-2006.	April 2007 through December 2008	Technical Assistance Specialist, Management Information Coordinator
Develop and/or strengthen parent to parent support networks to enhance public awareness to primary referral sources regarding referral of infants as required by IDEA, 2004.	January 2008	Family Technical Assistance and Monitoring Specialist, DES/AzEIP staff
Work in collaboration with NICU nurses and discharge planning teams to: (i) ensure appropriate referrals with required documentation to determine eligibility; and (ii) to support families in the NICU with referral, eligibility, and/or initial IFSP development as appropriate.	July 2008 and ongoing	DES/AzEIP, TAMS, AzEIP Service providing Agencies
Collaborate with the Arizona Department of Education to conduct coordinated, regional public awareness and child find activities.	July 2008	Family Technical Assistance and Monitoring Specialist, DES/AzEIP staff
Improve data collection related to child count.	January 2008-January 2009	DES/AzEIP Staff, Technical Assistance and Monitoring Specialists, Agency partners
Conduct monthly review of submitted data for	January 2008 and	DES/AzEIP staff

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
completeness and accuracy.	ongoing	
Implement data editing and validations processes in order to identify unusual findings in a timely manner, including regular review/monitoring of program/public agencies' practices in collecting, editing and reporting data.	July 2010 – June 2012	DES/AzEIP Staff, Agency partners, DTS
Implement system management and documentation procedures to ensure collection and reporting of accurate and timely data, including data collection, editing and validation, and reporting.	July 2010 – June 2012	DES/AzEIP Staff, Agency partners
<p>Develop and maintain collaborative partnerships with agencies and organizations and provide information about the nationally recognized key principles and practices of early intervention, AzEIP successes, and how and when to make a referral. Partners include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parent organizations • Early Head Start • AZ Department of Education and Schools • AHCCCS • AZ Academy of Pediatrics • Child Care • DES, Division of Children, Youth and Families • First Things First 	Ongoing	DES/AzEIP Staff, Technical Assistance and Monitoring Specialists, Agency partners, Early Intervention professionals, community partners
Incorporated herein are the improvement activities from Indicator #1 regarding implementation of the team-based model.		
Incorporated herein are the improvement activities from Indicator #6 regarding general public awareness, collaborative efforts, and data collection and analysis.		
Incorporated herein are the improvement activities from Indicator 14 regarding data management, editing and validation, and analysis.		
Incorporated herein are the improvement activities from: (i) Indicator 1 regarding development of a web-based data system; (ii) Indicator 1 regarding child and family assessment practices; and (iii) Indicator 1 follow-up strategies to ensure correct application of policies and procedures.		

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources

Indicator 6

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: Described in Indicator 1.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision / Child Find

Indicator – 6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to:

A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and

B. National data.

(20 USC 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

- A. Percent = # of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs divided by the population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 times 100 compared to the same percent calculated for other States with similar (narrow, moderate or broad) eligibility definitions.
- B. Percent = # of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs divided by the population **of infants and toddlers birth to 3** times 100 compared to National data.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process: Arizona utilizes a comprehensive and coordinated system of public awareness and child find efforts to locate, identify, and evaluate all potentially eligible children. Public awareness efforts are directed toward education, health and human service agencies (including agencies serving homeless children and families), tribes and tribal organizations, physicians, hospitals and other health care providers, families, and child protective services workers. Coordinated efforts include broad dissemination of information, presentation to and training of referral sources, joint child find activities with schools, health care and social service agencies, an online referral system, interagency agreements, and memoranda of understanding.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

A. Comparison to other states with narrow eligibility requirements:

Rank	State	Percentage of birth through 2 population served	Percentage increase in resident population birth through 2	Rank
1	Connecticut	3.16%	-.32%	14
2	North Dakota	3.02%	1.39%	4
3	Idaho	2.90%	2.09%	2
4	Maine	2.89%	.91%	8
5	Montana	2.21%	.46%	11
6	Oklahoma	2.03%	.50%	10
7	Utah	1.87%	-.04%	13
7	South Carolina	1.87%	.59%	9
8	Tennessee	1.80%	1.17%	6
9	Oregon	1.78%	.04%	12

10	District of Columbia	1.68%	3.20%	1
11	Nebraska	1.67%	1.03%	7
12	Arizona	1.61%	2.00%	3
13	Guam	1.47%	No Data	
14	Nevada	1.36%	1.99%	4
15	Georgia	1.34%	1.46%	5

B. Arizona’s national rankings with regard to number and percentage of infants and toddlers receiving early intervention services:

	Baseline	Percent change 2000 to 2004
National	2.24%	23%
Arizona	1.54%	21%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Among states with narrow eligibility requirements (as defined by OSEP) Arizona ranked 5th out of 8 based on December 2004 child count data. Among all states and territories Arizona ranked 45th out of 56.

According to the US Census Bureau, Arizona had the nation’s highest growth rate among children under 5 for the period April 2000 to July 2003. Arizona has the second highest population growth rate overall, just behind Nevada. The rapid growth of Arizona’s under-5 population is a very significant factor that continues to impact Arizona’s comparable child count data. The December 1 count of children served by AzEIP grew by 43% from 2000 to 2004. The percentage of the 0-3 population served increased from 1.27% to 1.54%, a 21% increase. During that same period the state experienced an overall population growth rate of 9.7%.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	1.59%
2006 (2006-2007)	1.65%
2007 (2007-2008)	1.72%
2008 (2008-2009)	1.80%
2009 (2009-2010)	1.88%
2010 (2010-2011)	1.95%

2011 (2011-2012)	1.84%
2012 (2012-2013)	1.86%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Improvement strategies to support Child Find and service provision to infants and toddlers.		
Continue PA efforts to primary referrals sources.	December 2005 and ongoing	TA Specialist, Local Program Coordinators, Technical Assistance & Monitoring Specialists, CQI Coordinators
Improve data collection related to child count.	January 2008- January 2009	DES/AzEIP Staff, Technical Assistance and Monitoring Specialists, Agency Partners
Move child count date from December 1 to October 1.	October 2010	DES/AzEIP Staff, DES Division of Technology Services
Incorporated herein are the improvement activities for: Indicator # 1 regarding the team-based model; (i) Indicator 5, regarding (a) partnerships and agencies that represent primary referral sources, and (b) regarding collection and analysis of public awareness data, and (ii) Indicator 14, regarding data management, editing and validation, and		

Indicator 7

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: Described in Indicator 1.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision / Child Find

Indicator – 7. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline.

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

Account for untimely evaluations.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The unique composition of Arizona, both geographically and culturally, present unique challenges in ensuring that all families and children have an IFSP developed within 45 days of referral. Located in the southwest United States, Arizona is composed of densely populated metropolitan areas and vast, desert rural areas. It has 21 tribes represented with different regulatory bodies and different cultures and languages. For example, Havasupai Reservation located deep within a gorge of the Grand Canyon, can only be reached by an eight mile hike, horseback ride or helicopter. Arizona borders Mexico on the south. Arizona also has a population of migrant workers who travel to Arizona with their families and work seasonally. Arizona also has four military bases. All of these factors contribute to the many challenges of ensuring families receive the evaluation and assessment and initial IFSP meeting within 45 days from referral.

Referrals to the early intervention program are received by Initial Planning Process (IPP) contractors throughout the State. The IPP contractors implement screening, as appropriate, to identify children suspected of having a developmental delay or disability as defined by Arizona’s eligibility criteria. For children suspected of having a developmental delay or disability, the IPP contractor conducts a multidisciplinary evaluation and assessment, determines AzEIP eligibility, and facilitates the determination of eligibility for one or more of the AzEIP service providing agencies, of which there are four. If eligible, the IPP contractor then works in partnership with the family and individuals likely to be involved in ongoing service coordination and service delivery to develop the Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP).

Arizona interprets compliance with the 45-day timeline as completion of the IFSP (rather than conducting the initial IFSP meeting). This may significantly limit the State’s ability to demonstrate compliance.

Individual child evaluation and assessment and IFSP data is tracked through the ACTS system and AzEIP service providing agency tracking systems. The data is tracked and reported on a monthly basis. The data is reviewed, analyzed, and reported by contractor, program, and region on a quarterly basis. AzEIP focuses monitoring and improvement efforts on those regions/contractors experiencing the most difficulty. Arizona continues to work on improving its timelines for evaluation, assessment and initial IFSP development, an ongoing area of non-compliance.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Eligible children	Eligible children with IFSPs conducted within 45 day timeline	Percent of eligible children for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP was conducted within 45 day timeline
3266	1115	34%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The data reveals considerable variation across regions, contractors and programs with regard to the timeliness of evaluation and assessment and IFSP. During 2004-2005, three of fourteen programs reported that for more than 60% of referrals, initial IFSPs were developed within 45 days; in contrast, four contractors reported rates of less than 30%. Compared to 2003-2004 data there was some improvement in program performance.

Data confirmed anecdotal reports from contractors that evaluations and AzEIP eligibility determinations are conducted in a more timely manner, with 75% of evaluations and assessments completed within 45 days and 92% conducted within 71 days. In contrast, only 63% of initial IFSPs were developed within 71 days of the initial referral, and 85% are developed within 99 days. Data and anecdotal reports indicate that there are significant difficulties (i) coordinating initial IFSP development with the ongoing service coordination providers, and (ii) ensuring capacity to provide ongoing service coordination. Initial results from file reviews conducted during monitoring visits support these anecdotal reports.

The ACTS data tracking system has been revised to gather more detailed data related to the reason for timeline delays for eligibility determination, and initial IFSP meeting. This additional data is being collected as of September 2005 and will be reviewed beginning November 2005. It is hoped that the "reason" data will provide focus for improvement efforts at the program, regional and state level. AzEIP continues to work with other agency data systems to add fields to collect required data elements.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	37%
2006 (2006-2007)	60%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%

2010 (2010-2011)	100%
2011 (2011-2012)	100%
2012 (2012-2013)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Clarify "initial IFSP meeting" for purposes of 45-day timeline.	February 2006	DES/AzEIP Staff
Update IFSP form and related procedures, as needed, to align with SPP indicators.		
Revise IFSP to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● clarify "Start Date" as "Planned Start Date"; ● document dissemination of family survey annually. 	January 2006 – March 2006	CQI Coordinators, CSPD Coordinator, Technical Assistance & Monitoring Specialist
Disseminate revised IFSP form with guidance.	March 2006	CQI Coordinators, Technical Assistance & Monitoring Specialists, CSPD Coordinator
Provide targeted and general technical assistance through Regional meetings, on-site and phone meetings with TAMS and/or DES/AzEIP staff, written guidance/clarification and other strategies. Technical assistance will address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Family Rights ● Transition; ● Team-based early intervention; ● Service Coordination; ● Financial Matters, including FCP, Medicaid private insurance ● Child Indicators/child Indicator Forms; and ● Data Collection and Reporting Requirements. 	July 2011- 2012	DES/AzEIP, AzEIP partner agencies, AzEIP service providing agencies,
Utilize root cause analysis process to identify challenges and barriers to correction of noncompliance.	July 2010 and ongoing	DES/AzEIP, AzEIP partner agencies, AzEIP service providing agencies, TAMS, and ICC
Review of Regional Resource Center website material for Indicator 7 (45-day timeline).	July- September 2010	DES/AzEIP Staff
Incorporated herein are the improvement activities from: (i) Indicator 1 regarding expansion of the team-based model and functional, participation-		

based practices; (ii) Indicator 1 regarding recruitment and retention; (iii) Indicator 2 regarding the AzEIP Standards of Practice; (iv) Indicator 9 regarding revising and implementing General Supervision policies, procedures, tools and forms, root cause analysis, and enforcement and sanctions; and (v) Indicator 14 regarding data management, editing and validation, and analysis.		
---	--	--

Indicator 8

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: Described in Indicator 1.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision / Effective Transition

Indicator – 8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:

- A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;**
- B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and**
- C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B)**

Measurement:

- A. Percent = # of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services divided by # of children exiting Part C times 100.
- B. Percent = # of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred divided by the # of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B times 100.
- C. Percent = # of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred divided by the # of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

- A. Throughout a child’s eligibility with AzEIP, families are informed that supports and services are provided until their child’s third birthday. AzEIP’s current IFSP form contains the required steps for transitioning children and their families on the Transition Plan and Timeline pages. The service coordinator is charged with facilitating the transition and documenting the steps as they are completed. Technical assistance and training has been provided throughout the past year to inform service coordinators of the requirement to document all steps.
- B. For children who are potentially eligible for Part B services, DES/AzEIP and the Arizona Department of Education adopted policies and procedures to ensure a smooth transition from Part C programs to Part B preschool programs and to identify the responsibilities of each agency during the transition process. These procedures are memorialized in an Intergovernmental Agreement (Transition IGA) and apply to all AzEIP service providing agencies. The Transition IGA, effective November 2004, outlines responsibilities of Public Education Agencies (PEAs) and early intervention providers, including the notification of PEA at two specific times during the year of children potentially eligible for Part B. During FY 2004, DES/AzEIP used the data from this biannual notification of all children potentially eligible for Part B as its baseline data.

During the 2005-2006 reporting period, the measurement for this item was changed to align with the new IFSP form and the provision of the Transition IGA requiring notification to the LEA of a transition conference for children who may be eligible for Part B. DES/AzEIP revised its Child File Audit Tool and used data collected from Cycle 3 monitoring as new baseline data in FY 2005.

The measurement captures individual data on children for whom a transition conference is planned with the LEA to discuss options for Part B.

- C. The service coordinator facilitates a transition conference with the child's parent(s), a provider from the IFSP team, and a PEA representative, when the child is between two years six months and two years nine months of age. The service coordinator is required to document the transition conference utilizing a Transition Conference Summary, which contains the date of the transition meeting. AzEIP uses monitoring data from on-site monitoring visits for this sub-indicator, reviewing child files to determine whether the transition conference occurred within required timelines.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

A. IFSPs with transition steps and services

File Reviews	# of Files Reviewed	# Compliant	% Compliant
Site visits	67	36	54%

B. Notification

33 of 34 service coordination providing agencies/programs provided notification to the LEA of all children potentially eligible for Part B = 97% compliance.

C. Transition conference

File Reviews	# of Files Reviewed	# Compliant	% Compliant
Site visits	51	24	47%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Each child's IFSP includes a Transition Plan and Timelines section outlining the specific transition steps and services required. Programs were determined compliant when the IFSP included documentation of the assigned responsibilities for transition and the dates completed. While service coordinators reported that they facilitated the steps throughout the transition process, including the transition conference, there was inconsistent documentation on the IFSP itself. The lack of documentation appeared to be a primary contributing factor to the low compliance rating.

The revised Transition IGA went into effect in November 2004 and statewide training was provided to all service coordinators across the AzEIP service providing agencies in the following months. The Transition IGA requires the service coordinator to complete a "Transition Conference Planning" form at the time of the transition conference, identifying the steps, responsible person(s), and timelines to ensure the child transitions at age three. While the Program Self-Assessments and Cycle 1 monitoring visits occurred prior to the Transition IGA, Cycle 2 visits occurred afterwards. Those Cycle 2 programs monitored in early summer 2005, showed significantly higher compliance with documenting transition steps and services and the transition conference date. For example, of the 20 files reviewed, 14 (70%) included documentation of transition steps and services. Of 18 files reviewed, 14 (77%) included documentation that the transition conferences were held between 2.6 – 2.9. The improvement in the documentation may be directly related to the training on the Transition IGA and the subsequent implementation of the new forms and requirements.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100%
2006 (2006-2007)	100%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%
2011 (2011-2012)	100%
2012 (2012-2013)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Update IFSP form and related procedures, as needed, to align with SPP indicators		
Revise IFSP and IFSP Guidance document to delineate transition steps and services.	March - May 2006	CQI Coordinators, CSPD Coordinator, Technical Assistance & Monitoring Specialist
Disseminate revised IFSP form with guidance document.	July 2006	CQI Coordinators, Technical Assistance & Monitoring Specialists, CSPD Coordinator
Provide technical assistance related to required documentation of transition information on the IFSP and related documents.	July - September 2006	CQI Coordinators, Technical Assistance & Monitoring Specialists
Prepare and disseminate written technical assistance (such as a Technical Assistance Bulletin) on transition policy and procedures.	October 2007	TAMS, CQI Coordinators and CSPD Coordinator

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Revise monitoring tools to collect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reason data when transition conference not held as required. - date when conference held. 	February – March 2007	TAMS and CQI Coordinators
Focused technical assistance requiring programs to drill down issues when non-compliance identified.	June 2007	CQI Coordinators and TAMS
Revise, if needed, the Transition IGA to align with Frequently Asked Questions document issued by OSEP in December 2009.	July 2010	DES/AzEIP Staff, ADE 619 Coordinator, ICC, SEAP, and AzEIP TAMS
Incorporated herein are the improvement activities from (i) Indicator 1 regarding expansion of the team-based model and functional, participation-based practices; (ii) Indicator 1 regarding recruitment and retention; (iii) Indicator 2 regarding the AzEIP Standards of Practice; (iv) Indicator 9 regarding revising and implementing General Supervision policies, procedures, tools and forms, root cause analysis, and enforcement and sanctions, and; (v) Indicator 14 regarding data management, editing and validation, and analysis.	June 2012	
Revise monitoring tools to collect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reason data when transition conference not held as required. - date when conference held. 	February – March 2007	CSPD Coordinator, CQI Coordinators; TA & Monitoring Specialists
Provide technical assistance to assist local communities in preparing procedures to ensure smooth transition and to resolve challenges.	September 2007 and ongoing	CSPD Coordinator, CQI Coordinators TA & Monitoring Specialists
Focused technical assistance requiring programs to drill-down issues when non-compliance identified.	June 2007	CQI Coordinator, ADE, Technical Assistance and Monitoring Specialists
Develop and implement follow-up strategies to ensure correct and consistent application of the policies and practices that were the subject of the training and technical assistance.	December 2012	DES/AzEIP staff and its agency partners, ICC, TAMS, Raising Special Kids, early intervention professionals

Indicator 9

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: Described in Indicator 1.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision / General Supervision

Indicator – 9. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification

Measurement:

A Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**Arizona's Continuous Monitoring and Quality Improvement System (CMQIS)**Overview

DES/AzEIP administers a multi-faceted Continuous Monitoring and Quality Improvement System (CMQIS), which includes: (1) family surveys and interviews; (2) Program Self-Assessments (PSA); (3) periodic desk audits; (4) cyclical on-site monitoring reviews and/or focused monitoring reviews; and (5) agency level reviews. The system is on a five-year monitoring cycle. The following describes each facet of the system:

- 1) Family Surveys
 - Distributed to families at their initial and annual Individualized Family Service Plan meetings
 - DES/AzEIP provides a summary of the family survey results to programs.
 - The programs reflect the survey results in the annual Program Self-Assessment
 - Areas of non-compliance are addressed in the corrective action plan and used to target areas for improvement and technical assistance
- 2) Program Self-Assessment
 - Annually, each agency's service coordination unit(s) submit the AzEIP Program Self-Assessment to their contracting agency and/or to DES/AzEIP.
 - The PSA spans the cluster areas of General Supervision, Child Find, Early Intervention in Natural Environments, and Transition.
 - This self-assessment is based on data and documents program performance related to AzEIP policies and procedures and IDEA, Part C requirements, using tools including the Child File Audit, the Personnel File Audit, the Physical Setup Checklist, and the PSA itself.
 - Based on data gathered through the PSA, agencies are required to develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for any areas of non-compliance.
- 3) Desk Audits

- DES/AzEIP conducts a review of all existing data submitted to DES/AzEIP by the AzEIP participating agencies (including DES/AzEIP contractors) and analyzes the data to identify areas of strength and areas in need of correction/improvement planning.
- If areas of non-compliance are identified through the Desk Audit process, DES/AzEIP ensures the areas on non-compliance are addressed through the programs existing Corrective Action Plan, if the non-compliance is not already included. Focused on-site monitoring visits may also be conducted.

4) Site Reviews

- DES/AzEIP established a 5 year monitoring cycle for conducting site reviews based on population and risk factors. Maricopa County, which consists of 60% of the population in the State and had known system concerns and compliance issues, was chosen for Cycle 1. Cycle 2, 3, 4, and 5 were chosen by risk factors, and then grouped geographically. Although each cycle receives a site visit every five years, DES/AzEIP may conduct a site review outside of the cycle when serious issues of non-compliance are identified through complaints, desk audits, PSA and/or when issues of non-compliance are not corrected.
- Site visits are a synthesis and verification of Program Self-Assessment, desk audits, and child, personnel, and financial file reviews.
- Prior to a site visit, DES/AzEIP reviews:
 - Agency/program policies and procedures,
 - Financial information,
 - ACTS/MIS data,
 - Family Survey data,
 - Program Self-Assessment data, and
 - Dispute resolution information
- The site review results in a summary report, and if needed, a corrective action plan to ensure compliance with IDEA, Part C and AzEIP policies and procedures, as well as, improvement of program practice, within one year of the monitoring visit.

5) Agency level

The Intergovernmental Agreement involving AzEIP participating agencies required under A.R.S. § 8-652 provides corrective action according to its terms, relevant law, and policies and procedures, to address non-compliance. AzEIP participating agencies that provide early intervention services also report monthly data to DES/AzEIP on: timeline compliance, services identified on the IFSP and services provided, and fiscal resource information.

Identification of Non-Compliance

When areas of non-compliance are identified, programs are required to complete and submit a Corrective Action Plan (CAP). Components of the CAP include:

- Analysis of the “root cause” of non-compliance
- Outline of targets (proposed evidence of change)
- Activities to achieve results
- Projected timelines (one year or less)
- Persons responsible
- Available resources
- Technical assistance needs to correct non-compliance

Follow up to CAP includes:

- Submission to, and approval by, the state agency/program representative and DES/AzEIP;
- Once approved, a program submits, as required, status updates at 45 days, 6 months, and annually, to its contracted agency and/or DES/AzEIP;
- If 6 month progress report does not show a program progressing towards compliance, the regional Technical Assistance and Monitoring Specialist (TAMS) assigned to the program will meet with the program to further investigate root causes of the non-compliance. The TAMS

will provide identified technical assistance directly or access it through other available resources.

- DES/AzEIP notifies the program, in writing, three months prior to their one year correction period, that their program will be contacted to schedule a site visit to verify correction of non-compliance;
- If DES/AzEIP confirms the program has reached compliance for all items in the CAP, AzEIP issues a close-out letter to the program.

Technical Assistance System

Arizona's CQIMS is directly linked to its Technical Assistance (TA) System, which responds to system needs identified through the CQIMS, the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD), and identified State initiatives. Technical assistance is provided in a variety of ways to ensure that the assimilation and application of information is available to the early intervention community, including dissemination through listservs, and posting TA bulletins on the AzEIP website. The overall goal of the TA system is to provide programs with the opportunity to enhance their confidence and competence in providing early intervention supports and services in accordance with IDEA, Part C, and AzEIP policies and procedures. TAMS have been designated to support and provide technical assistance to early intervention programs in their regions throughout the monitoring process. The TAMS will aid in the program's development of their Program Self Assessments, preparation for on-site monitoring visits, development and implementation of corrective action plans, and the provision of identified technical assistance and training. The regional TAMS have access to a breadth of expertise through the DES/AzEIP staff and other TAMS to effectively support programs to improve performance and compliance. The TAMS also have access to the TA Cadre for TA and training in identified priority areas and facilitating the integration of that TA information into practice.

Corrective Measures and Remedies-

AzEIP ensures the enforcement of corrective measures and remedies in conjunction with the monitoring system, including:

- A. required submission of additional documentation and/or increased frequency of reporting concerning area(s) of non-compliance and strategies to improve compliance;
- B. focused monitoring visits to review files, meet with staff, identify strategies for improvement, and prepare a plan to address areas of non-compliance;
- C. implementation of a corrective action plan, including timelines for implementation;
- D. revising contract terms and provisions when necessary, and with appropriate notice;
- E. adjustment or withholding of whole or partial payment until satisfactory resolution of default/non-compliance;
- F. suspension of all or part of the contract; and
- G. termination of the contract in whole or in part.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

2004-2005 was the first year the Arizona CMQIS was implemented, therefore Arizona does not have baseline data for previous fiscal years. Every agency or contracted program providing service coordination participated in the monitoring process through submission of program self-assessments, and for Cycles 1 and 2, on site reviews. Programs submitted their close-out CAP data and annual PSAs November 2005 through February 2006. The data was reviewed and analyzed, the number of corrections complied, and the data reported in the March 2006 Compliance Agreement Quarterly Report. This baseline data is set out below as well as reported in DES/AzEIP APR for FFY 2005.

46% of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance identified 2004-2005 =434
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from identification 2005-2006 = 201

Percent = [201 divided by 434] times 100 = 46%

The baseline data for this indicator is based on data collected during 2005-2006 from

- Cycle 1 and Cycle 2 Site Reviews
- Cycle 3, 4, and 5 Program Self-Assessment
- State Complaint Log
- State's Data System.

Taken together, these data sources represent 31/31 service coordination programs in the State. The correction data was submitted by each program in accordance with their Corrective Action Plan. For many of the findings of non-compliance, this required two Child File Audits per service coordinator, with the resulting data submitted to DES/AzEIP for review. If the data submitted through the child file audits was inconsistent with data from the State's data system or complaints received by AzEIP, the AzEIP Continuous Quality Improvement Coordinator (CQI) and the Technical Assistance and Monitoring Specialist (TAMS) visited the program to review additional files, provide TA, and to identify new activities for improvement, if needed.

Table A is a breakdown of the data by the Monitoring Priority Areas (SPP Indicators 1, 7, 8,) and then by Monitoring Non-Priority Areas, which include the additional federal requirements. Arizona has clustered the non-priority areas by Child Find, IFSP required components, Service Coordination, and Procedural Safeguards.

Table A			
31 programs	# of Identified Non-compliance	# Corrected	% Corrected < 1 year
Monitoring Priority Areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 45-days ▪ Timely Services ▪ Transition 	58	19	33%
			Not Corrected: 45-day: 11/11 programs Timely Services: 15/29 programs Transition: 13/29 programs See analysis below
Monitoring Non-priority Areas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Child Find ▪ IFSP ▪ Service Coordination ▪ Procedural Safeguards 	406	195	48%
Complaints	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total	464	214	46%

Analysis of Table A:

Monitoring Priority Areas

The data indicates the success the State has experienced in its ability to identify and correct noncompliance. It also reflects the challenge the State has in meeting the 45-day timeline, timely provision of services, and to some extent ensuring each child received timely transition planning. A thorough discussion of the State’s improvement activities and strategies related to the monitoring priority areas can be found in Indicators 1, 7, and 8.

Monitoring Non-Priority Areas

A drill-down of the outstanding non-compliance of the monitoring non-priority areas by program, county, and statewide revealed that most programs had made improvements in ensuring evaluations were completed by a multi-disciplinary team, documenting service coordination activities, and providing procedural safeguards at the appropriate times. However, statewide programs continue to be noncompliant in Child Find related to evaluations not including all areas of development; most specifically vision and hearing. While many programs made significant correction to include the required components of the IFSP, ensuring that the child’s present levels of development included all areas of development; specifically vision and hearing, writing functional outcomes and ensuring the frequency, intensity, start and end of each service were included the IFSP, seemed to be systemic statewide issues.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	25%
2006 (2006-2007)	50%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%
2011 (2011-2012)	100%
2012 (2012-2013)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Revise, disseminate, and implement the Interagency Agreements with the AzEIP participating Agencies to address general supervision requirements.	April 30, 2006	DES/AzEIP, the State Interagency Team, and the Attorney General's Office.
Implement the Program Self-Assessment with Service Coordination providers statewide.	In accordance with established monitoring cycles	CQI Coordinators, TA and Monitoring Specialists, Local Program Coordinators (LPCs) and agency partners
Implement appropriate sanctions or enforcement activities for failure to complete corrective action items.	February 2007 and on-going	DES/AzEIP staff and agency partners
Explore incentives for programs with close-outs in 9 months or less.	February 2007	CQI Coordinators and agency partners
Update IFSP form to document dissemination of family survey annually.	January 2006 – March 2006	CQI Coordinators, CSPD Coordinator, Technical Assistance & Monitoring Specialist
Incorporated herein are the improvement activities from (i) Indicator 1 regarding expansion of the team-based model and functional, participation-based practices; (ii) Indicator 1 regarding recruitment and retention; (iii) Indicator 2 regarding the AzEIP Standards of Practice; and; (iv) Indicator 14 regarding data management, editing and validation, and analysis.		
Revise General Supervision policies, procedures, forms and/or tools to integrate general supervision components and align with federal and State requirements, including child and family outcomes. The revised General Supervision system will incorporate the principles and practices of desk audit, program self-assessment, focused monitoring, data validation, corrective action, enforcement, family outcomes surveys and review of complaint logs	July 2010	AzEIP Continuous Monitoring and Quality Improvement Coordinator, AzEIP Technical Assistance and Monitoring Specialists (TAMS).
Evaluate General Supervision policies, procedures, forms and tools, revise and improve efficiency and effectiveness.	June 2012, 2013	CQI Coordinators, TAMS
Utilize root cause analysis process to identify challenges and barriers to correction of non-compliance.	July 2010 and ongoing per General Supervision procedures	DES/AzEIP staff, TAMS, Early Intervention Programs
Pursue contract sanctions to address noncompliance not corrected within 1 year. (2009-2010)	July 2010 and ongoing per new General Supervision procedures	DES/AzEIP staff, DES Office of Procurement
DDD will, with modification appropriate to DDD, implement AzEIP policies and procedures for early intervention services for children birth to three and their families. Policies, procedures, directives, and other	July 2010 and ongoing	DES/AzEIP staff, DES/DDD, TAMS

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
<p>guidelines will comply with IDEA Part C and AzEIP.</p>		
<p>Provide targeted and general technical assistance through Regional meetings, on-site and phone meetings with TAMS and/or DES/AzEIP staff, written guidance/clarification and other strategies. Technical assistance will address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Family Rights • Transition • Team-based early intervention • Service Coordination • Financial Matters, including FCP, Medicaid private insurance • Child Indicators/Child Indicator Forms • Data Collection and Reporting Requirement 	<p>July 2012 and ongoing</p>	<p>DES/AzEIP staff and its agency partners, ICC, TAMS, Raising Special Kids, early intervention professionals</p>
<p>Incorporated herein are the improvement activities from Indicator 1 regarding targeted and general technical assistance; follow up strategies to ensure correct and consistent application of the policies and practices that were the subject of the training and technical assistance; and the AzEIP Standards of Practice; Indicator 14 regarding data management, editing and validation, and analysis.</p>		

Indicator 10

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: Described in Indicator 1.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision / General Supervision

Indicator – 10. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

Measurement: Percent = (1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by (1.1) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

DES/AzEIP ensures that any individual or organization may file a written, signed complaint with DES/AzEIP alleging any violation of the requirements of IDEA, Part C. The information describing the procedures to resolve disputes, including filing a complaint and requesting mediation and a due process hearing, are contained in the Procedural Safeguards for Families handbook (the “Handbook”). DES/AzEIP disseminates Handbooks to all agencies and programs that provide service coordination from its office and through the AzEIP Local Program Coordinators. The Handbook is also available at the parent training centers and the information is available on the DES/AzEIP website.

Families are provided the Handbook upon request and in conjunction with the following events: initial evaluation and assessment; eligibility determination; prior written notice; and six month, annual or other IFSP reviews. The Handbook is printed in English and Spanish. Service Coordinators are responsible for providing families with these booklets and explaining the information in the booklet to families. Families are informed that they may file a formal complaint and use the informal complaint resolution process at the same time. If appropriate, Service Coordinators may help families file a formal complaint. Service Coordinators, as well as, all providers of early intervention services, are required to attend AzEIP’s Standards of Practice training entitled Policies and Professionalism, wherein information concerning families’ procedural safeguards is discussed.

To file a system complaint, an individual or organization must send a written, signed complaint to the Executive Director of DES/AzEIP, include a statement that the State has violated a requirement or regulation of IDEA, Part C, and provide the facts of the situation. The Executive Director or designee reviews the complaint to determine its validity for follow-up. A complaint is judged valid if the alleged violation occurred not more than 1 year before the date the complaint was received, unless (a) the alleged violation continues for the child or other children, or (b) the complainant is requesting reimbursement or corrective action for a violation that occurred not more than 3 years before the complaint was received. The Executive Director or designee reviews all relevant information and conducts an independent on-site investigation, if necessary, and gives the complainant the opportunity to submit additional information, either orally or in writing, about the allegations in the complaint.

The Executive Director or designee makes an independent determination as to whether the agency is violating a requirement or regulation of IDEA, Part C. The Executive Director of DES/AzEIP sends a written decision to all parties within 60 days from the date of receipt of the complaint. The decision addresses each allegation in the complaint and includes the findings of fact and conclusions and the reasons for the final decision. When appropriate, DES/AzEIP’s decision also includes procedures for technical assistance, negotiation, and corrective action plans for bringing an agency into compliance. In resolving a complaint in which it finds a failure to provide appropriate services, DES/AzEIP, pursuant to its general supervisory authority under IDEA, Part C addresses:

- (1) how it will remediate the denial of those services, including, as appropriate, the awarding of monetary reimbursement or other corrective action appropriate to the needs of the child and the child's family; and
- (2) appropriate future provision of services for all infant and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

All investigations and resolutions are completed within 60 days of original receipt of the complaint. An extension may be granted in extraordinary cases only where the nature or severity of allegations warrants further investigation. If a written complaint is received that is also the subject of a due process hearing, or contains multiple issues, of which one or more are part of that hearing, DES/AzEIP sets aside any part of the complaint that is being addressed in the due process hearing until the conclusion of the hearing. However, any issue in the complaint that is not a part of the due process action is resolved within the 60-calendar day timeline using the procedure described above. If an issue is raised in a complaint that has previously been decided in a due process hearing involving the same parties, the hearing decision is binding, and DES/AzEIP informs the complainant to that effect.

If an AzEIP participating agency utilizes its own process for dispute resolution, it ensures through written agreement that its policies and procedures are consistent with the rules and regulations of 34 CFR 303.419-425 and DES/AzEIP policies. If the child who is the subject of the dispute is also eligible for another Federal or State program, which has its own dispute resolution process, DES/AzEIP and the other administrative entity will collaborate to determine jurisdiction based on the nature of the complaint. For all complaints alleging failure to implement AzEIP according to IDEA, Part C, DES/AzEIP will facilitate or designate an AzEIP participating agency to facilitate the dispute resolution process according to IDEA, Part C. If the complaint involves an application for initial services, the child must receive those services that are not in dispute. Complaints alleging a failure by an AzEIP participating agency or contractor to implement a due process hearing decision must be resolved by DES/AzEIP.

DES/AzEIP monitors the provision of procedural safeguards to families through its Continuous Monitoring and Quality Improvement System, through agencies' and programs' self-assessment, on-site monitoring visits, and response to family complaints. Family interview questions also gather information telephonically during the on-site visits about whether families understand their rights in the early intervention program. The NCSEAMS family survey additionally asks parents about whether they know their rights in the early intervention system.

DES/AzEIP logs formal and informal complaints to ensure the information is captured accurately and that all complaints are resolved in a timely manner. DES/AzEIP monitors the trends and themes from both its formal and informal complaint log and compares with its monitoring data. Technical assistance and/or focused monitoring are undertaken as appropriate and corrective action plans prepared.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

100%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

DES/AzEIP received four formal complaints, one in which a report with no findings was issued within the 60 day time frame. The three remaining complaints were resolved informally and subsequently withdrawn within the 60 day timeframe.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100%
2006 (2006-2007)	100%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%
2011 (2011-2012)	100%
2012 (2012-2013)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
DES/AzEIP Continuous Quality Improvement Coordinators will utilize the formal Complaint Log to track dispute resolutions carried out by an AzEIP service providing agency, to ensure complaints, findings, and timelines adhere to AzEIP Policies and Procedures and IDEA, Part C.	January 2007	CQI Coordinators
Continued implementation of the AzEIP Standards of Practice to support understanding of how and when to provide families with their procedural safeguards.	July 2011-2012	CSPD Coordinator, ASDTP Staff
Implement a reminder system to alert the complaint investigator a week prior to a complaint due date that the 60- day timeline is about to expire.	January 2006	CQI Coordinators
Incorporated herein are the improvement activities from: (i) Indicator 1 regarding expansion of the team-based model and functional, participation-based practices; (ii) Indicator 1 regarding		

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
recruitment and retention; (iii) Indicator 2 regarding the AzEIP Standards of Practice; (iv) Indicator 9 regarding revising and implementing General Supervision policies, procedures, tools and forms, root cause analysis, and enforcement and sanctions, (v) Indicator 11 regarding revision of the AzEIP Procedural Safeguards Handbook, and; (vi) Indicator 14 regarding data management, editing and validation, and analysis.		
Develop template for extending timelines when there are exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.	March 1, 2010	DES/AzEIP Continuous Quality Coordinator; NECTAC, and MPRRC for technical assistance.
Provide targeted and general technical assistance through regional meetings, on-site and phone meetings with TAMS and/or DES/AzEIP staff, written guidance/clarification and other strategies. Technical assistance will address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Family Rights. 	June 2011, 2012	DES/AzEIP staff, TAMS
Complete revision of and provide training and technical assistance on new Family Rights Handbook.	June 2013	DES/AzEIP staff, ICC and its Committees, community partners.

Indicator 11

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: Described in Indicator 1.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision / General Supervision

Indicator – 11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.

Measurement: Percent = (3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by (3.2) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The overview of how and when families receive information about their procedural safeguards concerning due process hearings is found in the Overview for Indicator GS 10, along with the mechanisms DES/AzEIP has in place to monitor and correct non-compliance areas. All due process hearings are carried out at a time and place that is reasonably convenient to the family. A hearing may be initiated on any matters related to AzEIP’s proposal or refusal to initiate or change the: (a) identification of the child; (b) evaluation of the child; (c) placement of the child; or (d) provision of early intervention services to the child and family.

To initiate a due process hearing, the following steps must be taken:

- A. A written request must be filed with the appropriate participating agency representative or with the Executive Director of DES/AzEIP.
- B. The appropriate AzEIP participating agency representative, or the Executive Director of DES/AzEIP or a designee, appoints a trained, impartial hearing officer.
- C. The hearing officer:
 - (1) has knowledge about the provisions of IDEA, Part C and the needs of, and services available for, eligible children and their families;
 - (2) is not employed by the agency providing early intervention services to the child and family, except when a person who otherwise qualifies to conduct the hearing is paid by the agency solely to serve as a hearing officer; and
 - (3) does not have a personal or professional interest that would conflict with his or her objectivity in implementing the process.
- D. The hearing officer:
 - (1) listens to the presentation of relevant viewpoints about the dispute;
 - (2) examines all information relevant to the issues;
 - (3) seeks a timely resolution; and
 - (4) provides a record of the proceedings including a written decision.
- E. The due process hearing procedure is completed and a written decision mailed to each of the parties within 30 days after the appropriate AzEIP participating agency or DES/AzEIP has received the request.
- F. Unless agreed upon by the family and the agency, there is no change made in the services received by the child during the pendency of the due process hearing prior to a final order by a Hearing Officer.
- G. The decision made in a hearing is final.

An AzEIP participating agency may follow its own due process hearing procedures, as long as they are consistent with the rules and regulations of 34 CFR §§303.419-425 and DES/AzEIP policies. If the child who is the subject of the hearing is also eligible for another Federal or State program, which has its own due process hearing procedures, DES/AzEIP and the other administrative entity will collaborate to determine jurisdiction based on the nature of the complaint. For all complaints alleging failure to comply with IDEA, Part C, DES/AzEIP will facilitate or designate an AzEIP participating agency to arrange the due process hearing according to IDEA, Part C. When an AzEIP participating agency uses its own process for a due process hearing, that agency must inform the Executive Director of DES/AzEIP within two days of receiving the complaint. The agency must then keep DES/AzEIP apprised of the progress of the dispute. If the AzEIP participating agency does not have its own procedures for due process hearings, or requires DES/AzEIP to facilitate the due process hearing for any reason, then the participating agency must inform DES/AzEIP within 24 hours of receiving the request.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Full compliance.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

One due process hearing request was filed and withdrawn within the 30 day timeframe as an informal resolution was reached between the parties involved.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
------------	---------------------------------------

2005 (2005-2006)	100%
2006 (2006-2007)	100%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%
2011 (2011-2012)	100%
2012 (2012-2013)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Continued implementation of the AZEIP Standards of Practice to support understanding of how and when to provide families with their procedural safeguards.	July 2011-2012	CSPD Coordinator, ASDTP Staff
Incorporated herein are the improvement activities from: (i) Indicator 1 regarding expansion of the team-based model and functional, participation-based practices; (ii) Indicator 1 regarding recruitment and retention; (iii) Indicator 2 regarding the AZEIP Standards of Practice; (iv) Indicator 9 regarding revising and implementing General Supervision policies, procedures, tools and forms, root cause analysis, and enforcement and sanctions; (v) Indicator 11 regarding revision of the AZEIP Procedural Safeguards Handbook; and; (vi) Indicator 14 regarding data management, editing and validation, and analysis	July 2010	

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
<p>Provide targeted and general technical assistance through regional meetings, on-site and phone meetings with TAMS and/or DES/AzEIP staff, written guidance/clarification and other strategies. Technical assistance will address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Family Rights 	<p>June 2011, 2012</p>	<p>DES/AzEIP staff, TAMS</p>
<p>Complete revision of and implement training/TA on new Family Rights Handbook.</p>	<p>June 2013</p>	<p>DES/AzEIP Staff, ICC and its Committees, community partners.</p>

Indicator 12 – Not Applicable

Indicator 13

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: Described in Indicator 1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority:

Indicator – 13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

Measurement: Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by (2.1) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

DES/AzEIP ensures that families receive information concerning their right to request mediation through the Families Rights Booklet. The overview of how and when families receive this information is found in the Overview for Indicator GS 10, along with the mechanisms DES/AzEIP has in place to monitor and correct non-compliance areas. Service Coordinators are trained through the AzEIP Standards of Practice, Policies and Professionalism training about a family's right to mediation under IDEA, Part C.

To initiate the mediation process, the following steps are taken:

- A. A family member or agency requests mediation, in writing, to the appropriate participating agency representative or to the Executive Director of DES/AzEIP.
- B. The appropriate AzEIP participating agency representative, or the Executive Director of DES/AzEIP or a designee, obtains written agreement to the mediation process by all other parties to the dispute.
- C. Once agreement is obtained, the appropriate AzEIP participating agency representative or the Executive Director of DES/AzEIP or designee, appoints a qualified, impartial mediator who is trained in effective mediation techniques and knowledgeable in laws and regulations related to all aspects of early intervention services.
- D. The appropriate AzEIP participating agency representative or the Executive Director of DES/AzEIP or a designee, ensures that each session of the mediation is scheduled in a timely manner and in a location convenient to all parties involved in the dispute.
- E. The appropriate AzEIP participating agency representative or the Executive Director of DES/AzEIP or a designee, ensures that agreements reached by all parties through mediation will be recorded in a written mediation agreement.

When a participating agency uses its own process for mediation, that agency must inform the Executive Director of DES/AzEIP within two days of receiving the request for mediation. The agency must then keep DES/AzEIP apprised of the progress of the request. If the AzEIP participating agency does not have its own procedures for mediation, or requires DES/AzEIP to facilitate the mediation process for any reason, then the participating agency must inform DES/AzEIP within 24 hours of receiving the request. The AzEIP participating agency or DES/AzEIP bears the cost of the mediation process. While mediation is pending, unless DES/AzEIP or the AzEIP participating agency and the family of a child otherwise agree, the child must continue to receive the appropriate early intervention services currently being provided.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Full compliance.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

One mediation request was received and withdrawn as an informal resolution was agreed upon by all parties.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources: NA

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision / General Supervision

Indicator – 14. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

Measurement: State reported data, including 618 data, State performance plan, and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, settings and November 1 for exiting, personnel, dispute resolution); and
b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring accuracy).

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Required data is collected through a variety of data systems utilized by participating State agencies and contracted programs. DES/AzEIP defines the data requirements, definitions, and values. All AzEIP State participating agencies and contractors are required to submit data to DES/AzEIP on a monthly basis.

After receipt of data by DES/AzEIP records are combined, unduplicated and run through a variety of programs to clean data, and perform edit checks and validations.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

A. Timely submission of data to OSEP:

All 618 reports and annual performance reports for 2004-2005 were submitted in a timely manner.

B. Accuracy of data:

DES/AzEIP utilizes collected data to produce a variety of management reports. These reports are reviewed and analyzed to assess data collection procedures and practices and to determine whether data was accurate and timely. Technical assistance, including provision of error reports, is provided to agencies and contractors as needed.

Site monitoring of early intervention programs includes comparing data recorded in a child's paper file with data recorded in the electronic record.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

A. AzEIP participating agencies (DES/Division of Developmental Disabilities, AZ Dept of Health Services, and AZ State Schools for the Deaf and the Blind) and contractors are asked to submit child data to DES/AzEIP utilizing AzEIP's file layout in order to prepare the 618 data reports; all agencies are currently complying with the request in a timely manner.

Throughout the reporting period, the DES/AzEIP data manager held meetings with the data managers from the AzEIP participating State agencies that provide early intervention service coordination and services, to discuss the data requirements. These discussions included review and definition of data elements required, and procedures for transmitting the data on a monthly basis. The State agencies are cooperative in the process, but the timeframe for making changes to large,

agency-wide data systems is often unpredictable.

B. Crosswalks are utilized where needed between agency data systems and DES/AzEIP data requirements. These crosswalks are developed by the DES/AzEIP data manager and the agency data managers. Crosswalks are currently required between DES/AzEIP and the DES Division of Developmental Disabilities for exit and IFSP data. A revision of the DDD data system is in process; DES/AzEIP is working with DDD to include all AzEIP data elements and eliminate the need for crosswalks.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100%
2006 (2006-2007)	100%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%
2011 (2011-2012)	100%
2012 (2012-2013)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Evaluate Results of ACTS system revision. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check reports for accuracy; • Check if data is properly entered and validated; • Develop plan to correct, if needed; • Technical Assistance, if needed; • Fix production problems and retest and 	Ongoing	TA Specialist, Management Information Coordinator

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
retain, if needed.		
Work with DES Division of Developmental Disabilities to revise the DDD data system to ensure inclusion of required data elements, reports and transfer of data to and from AzEIP.	July 2005- June 2006	TA Specialist, Management Information Coordinator, DDD
Revise data collection policies and procedures, as needed, and incorporate into policy and procedure manual.	February 2006	CQI Coordinators, TA and Monitoring Specialist, CSPD Coordinator
Align policies and procedures across all agencies and providers regarding data collection.	February 2006	CQI Coordinators, CSPD Coordinator, Executive Director, State Interagency Team, and TA and Monitoring Specialist
Implement data editing and validations processes in order to identify unusual findings in a timely manner, including regular review/monitoring of programs/public agencies' practices in collecting, editing and reporting data.	July 2010- June 2012	DES/AzEIP staff, Technical Assistance Specialists
Implement system management and documentation procedures to ensure collection and reporting of accurate and timely data, including data collection, editing and validation, and reporting.	July 2010 – June 2012	DES/AzEIP staff, Technical Assistance Specialists
<p>Provide targeted and general technical assistance through Regional meetings, on-site and phone meetings with TAMS and/or DES/AzEIP staff, written guidance/clarification and other strategies. Technical assistance will address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Family Rights • Transition • Team-based early intervention • Service Coordination • Financial Matters, including FCP, Medicaid, Private insurance • Child Indicators/Child Indicator Summary Forms • Data Collection and Reporting Requirements 	July 2010 – June 2010	DES/AzEIP staff, Technical Assistance Specialists
New data entry screens implemented by DDD in September 2006 to collect required data elements and to provide bridge to permanent DDD data system changes.	September 2006	Technical Assistance Specialist, Management Information Coordinator, DDD (Management Information Systems)

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
		MIS staff.
Training provided to service coordinators during September through November. User manual released in November 2006.	September – November 2006	DDD Help Desk Staff, DES/AzEIP Technical Assistance specialist
Implement and monitor the revised DDD system. Provide technical assistance, as needed, to resolve production problems, re-test and retrain.	September 2006 and ongoing	TA Specialist, Management Information Coordinator, DDD
Revise data collection policies and procedures, as needed, and incorporate into policy and procedure manual.	February 2006	CQI Coordinators, TA and Monitoring Specialist, CSPD Coordinator
Align policies and procedures across all agencies and providers regarding data collection.	February 2006	CQI Coordinators, CSPD Coordinator, Executive Director, State Interagency Team, and TA and Monitoring Specialist
Develop data handling and verification plan to ensure collection and reporting of accurate and timely data, including: Data collection Data editing and validation Data reporting System management Documentation	October 2007-June 2008	DES AzEIP staff
Implement data handling and verification plan to ensure collection and reporting of accurate and timely data.	January – June 2008	DES AzEIP staff
Incorporated herein are the improvement activities from (i) Indicator 1 regarding expansion of the team-based model and functional, participation-based practices; (ii) Indicator 1 regarding recruitment and retention; (iii) Indicator 2 regarding the AzEIP Standards of Practice; (iv) Indicator 9 regarding revising and implementing General Supervision policies, procedures, tools and forms, root cause analysis, and enforcement and sanctions.		

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Incorporated herein are the improvement activities from: (i) Indicator 1 regarding development of a web-based data system; and (ii) Indicator 1 regarding follow-up strategies to ensure correct application of policies and procedures.		

SPP /APR Attachment 1 (Form)

Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Complaints, Mediations, Resolution Sessions, and Due Process Hearings

SECTION A: Signed, written complaints	
(1) Signed, written complaints total	
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	
(a) Reports with findings	
(b) Reports within timeline	
(c) Reports within extended timelines	
(1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	
(1.3) Complaints pending	
(a) Complaints pending a due process hearing	

SECTION B: Mediation requests	
(2) Mediation requests total	
(2.1) Mediations	
(a) Mediations related to due process	
(i) Mediation agreements	
(b) Mediations not related to due process	
(i) Mediation agreements	
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	

SECTION C: Hearing requests	
(3) Hearing requests total	
(3.1) Resolution sessions	
(a) Settlement agreements	
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated)	
(a) Decisions within timeline SELECT timeline used { 30 day/Part C 45 day/Part B 45 day }	
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	

