

AZ
Part C

FFY2014
State Performance Plan /
Annual Performance Report

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

Executive Summary:

As Lead Agency for Arizona’s Early Intervention Program (AzEIP) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Part C, the Arizona Department of Economic Security (DES) is required to submit an Annual Performance Report (APR) describing the State’s compliance and performance relative to Federally-defined indicators. A review of the data collected for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2014 demonstrates there has been an increase in communication, coordination and collaboration between professionals from the AzEIP Team Based Early Intervention (TBEIS) contractors, Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD) employees and Arizona Schools for the Deaf and the Blind (ASDB) employees and contractors. These improvements are evidenced in both compliance and results indicators.

This annual report provides information on the State’s performance relative to targets in Arizona’s Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2014 to 2018. Data reflects compliance and performance for 41 team-based early intervention programs (EIP) throughout the State. The reporting period for FFY 2014 is July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015. Each EIP includes one AzEIP TBEIS contractor and service coordinators from DDD, and vision and hearing specialists from the ASDB. There are 41 EIPs throughout the state providing services in 22 defined geographic regions. State monitoring data, when used as the basis for reported data, includes data collected from 15 distinct EIPs located in 8 of the 22 geographic regions participating in cycle 2 of the state identified 3 year monitoring cycle.

Using TBEIS, Arizona ensures that all families, regardless of a child’s eligibility, are provided with a Core Team of professionals who use Natural Learning Opportunities, Teaming, Coaching, resource-based capacity-building and responsive care giving practices. These practices are collectively employed to support primary caregivers to assist their infants and toddlers with disabilities to engage and participate in everyday routines and activities.

The APR was developed with extensive stakeholder engagement, including discussion of the compliance and performance data relative to previous years and the State’s targets, the reasons for progress or slippage and the improvement activities that have or will effectuate meaningful results. DES/AzEIP engaged the Interagency Coordinating Council and other stakeholders in meetings throughout the year.

The FFY 2014 SPP/APR reflects a 300 percent increase in the number of children for whom child outcomes are reported, improved compliance with meeting continued improvement related to indicators for timely Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) development, and transition from early intervention while serving over two percent of this population for the first time. Data collected regarding the provision of timely services after initial IFSP development as well as some of the child outcomes indicators reflects slippage from last year’s results. FFY 2014 was the second full year of the statewide implementation of TBEIS. Many of the early intervention providers continued to make improvements to their implementation of the federal requirements and time lines. This, coupled with provider capacity issues, continued challenges in the data system, and AzEIP’s limited ability to generate reports to provide to EIPs, contributed to the areas of low performance reflected in the report. Given ongoing improvements to the current data system (I-TEAMS) and AzEIP’s increasing capacity to develop and run reports, as well as the ability by AzEIP staff to access data for ongoing monitoring and decision-making is expected to result in continued improvement in the next year’s APR (FFY 2015). Use of the data system to collect information has enabled Arizona to increase the percentage of entry and exit indicators that are reported annually for exiting children, to send Public Education Agency (PEA) notification to the State Education Agency (SEA) on behalf of EIPs, and to provide data reports to EIPs on a regular basis to support them in data entry and program improvement.

The following table provides a brief description of the indicators included in this report:

#	Indicator	Indicator Type	Indicator	FFY 2014	FFY 2013	Improvement
---	-----------	----------------	-----------	----------	----------	-------------

	Name	(Compliance or Results) & State Target	Description	(This Year)	(Last Year)	or Slippage
1	Timely Services	Compliance <i>Target: 100%</i>	Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.	74.83%	82.19%	Slippage
2	Settings	Results <i>Target: 90.00%</i>	Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.	98.21%	94.67%	Improvement
3	Child Outcomes	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)				
		Results <i>Target: 65.00%</i>	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 exited the program.	72.01%	71.73%	Improvement
		Results <i>Target: 58.00%</i>	The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program.	53.25%	55.36%	Slippage
		Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)				
		Results <i>Target: 73.00%</i>	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 exited the program.	77.61%	74.70%	Improvement
		Results <i>Target: 50.50%</i>	The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they exited the program.	53.75%	54.71%	Slippage
		Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs				
		Results <i>Target: 73.00%</i>	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 exited the program.	76.81%	75.90%	Improvement
		Results <i>Target: 50.50%</i>	The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they exited the	47.21%	53.58%	Slippage

			program.			
4	Family Outcomes	Results <i>Targets:</i> A:94.00 % B: 93.50% C:94.00 %	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	A: 95.37% B: 94.34% C: 95.72%	A: 97.50% B: 95.01% C: 98.40%	Slippage Slippage Slippage
5	Child Find, Ages Birth to One	Results <i>Target: .65%</i>	Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.	.89%	.76%	Improvement
6	Child Find, Ages Birth to Three	Results <i>Target: 1.87%</i>	Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.	2.09%	1.94%	Improvement
7	45-Day Timeline (Timeliness of IFSP)	Compliance <i>Target: 100%</i>	Percent of eligible 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.	88.61%	75.85%	Improvement
8	Transition	Compliance <i>Target: 100%</i>	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.	A: 79.37% B: 86.31% C: 80.85%	A: 56.69% B: 69.57% C: 70.34%	Improvement Improvement Improvement
9	Resolution Sessions	Compliance Target 100%	Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted). This is not applicable as Part B due process procedures have not been adopted by AzEIP.	N/A	N/A	No Change
10	Mediations	Results <i>Target: N/A</i>	Targets are set in the SPP/APR for programs with 10 or more requests for mediation as a method of dispute resolution.	N/A	N/A	No Change

			No mediation requests were received, therefore no targets are set and result is not applicable.			
11	Statewide Systemic Improvement Plan	Results	Due separately on April 1, 2016	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

General Supervision System:

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

GENERAL

DES awarded TBEIS contracts which were implemented in March 2013. These contracts establish the infrastructure to support service coordinators, speech–language pathologists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, developmental special instructionists, social work professionals and psychologists to work as a team in supporting families. All other IDEA, Part C early intervention required services are contracted and accessed through DES (e.g., nutrition, assistive technology). The new contracts are administered by DES/AzeIP and serve all families and their children, birth to three years of age, who are eligible for services funded by the DDD, the ASDB, and/or AzeIP (a.k.a. AzeIP-only). ASDB staff provide hearing and vision services to eligible children and their families. DDD and ASDB retain service coordination responsibilities for some DDD and/or ASDB eligible children and their families, including children enrolled in the Arizona Long Term Care System. This direction aligns contracts with evidence-based practice, establishes a uniform contract and rate structure for the DES/AzeIP’s most frequently utilized early intervention services, and responds to challenges with ensuring timely services in all areas of the State. For example, the Scope of Work requires the contractor to have the capacity, including the ability to expand to accommodate growth in the awarded region, to implement the initial planning process, service coordination and/or the IFSP for every child and family in the geographic area(s) specified in their contracted region. In addition, the contract process supports the lead agency in ensuring the federal requirements are implemented and evidence-based services are provided, resulting in improved outcomes for children and families. The State is able to impose sanctions and ultimately, if necessary, terminate contracts for poor performance.

In addition to implementing all new contracts, DES/AzeIP launched a web-based real time database that consolidated four of the five separate data systems that existed prior to the new TBEIS contracts. The database includes organization and contract related information, which requires that all early intervention professionals register in the system before they can be assigned to a child, child specific information, and billing information. This data system is used by all early intervention professionals throughout the state, including state staff from the Division of Developmental Disabilities and the Arizona State Schools for the Deaf and the Blind. Benefits for general supervision include the ability to inspect a child’s record in real-time from the state office (e.g., eligibility determination, services agreed upon during an IFSP meeting and/or services provided to or on behalf of a child and/or family), run reports by indicator, contractor and/or by services provided. Additional reports are still in development and the lead agency anticipates that once all reports are developed Early Intervention Programs (EIP) will have the ability to run reports at scheduled intervals to assist with internal data-based decision-making.

The infrastructure components of the Arizona Department of Economic Security's Arizona Early Intervention Program (DES/AzEIP) inform and are informed by one another. These components, including governance, fiscal, data, quality standards, personnel/workforce, and accountability collectively comprise AzEIP's general supervision system.

As part of its General Supervision responsibilities, DES/AzEIP ensures the following requirements are met:

- A. Monitoring the implementation of the statewide early intervention system;
- B. Making annual Determinations of each Early Intervention Program (EIP) using the four categories designated by the United States Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) as to the program's implementation of the requirements of IDEA, Part C: (1) meets requirements; (2) needs assistance; (3) needs intervention; and (4) needs substantial intervention. Local determinations are made available to the public on the DES/AzEIP website; and
- C. Enforcing the requirements of IDEA, Part C using appropriate, required enforcement mechanisms, as described in Chapter 2, General Supervision.

DEFINITION OF AN EARLY INTERVENTION PROGRAM (EIP)

An EIP is based in a DES/AzEIP defined region and consists of: the early intervention professionals working with one AzEIP Team-based Early Intervention Services contractor; the service coordinators employed by the DDD; and all ASDB service coordinators and Vision Specialists and Hearing Specialists who are assigned to the region. Each EIP has only one AzEIP Team-based Early Intervention Services contractor; and there may be more than one EIP in a region where there are multiple AzEIP Team-based Early Intervention Services contractors. There are currently 41 separate EIP groups providing services to children and families located in 22 early intervention designated regions within Arizona.

MONITORING, DETERMINATIONS AND CORRECTIVE ACTIONS

DES/AzEIP implements and oversees integrated monitoring activities, which ensure that the functions of IDEA, Part C are carried out statewide. The primary focus of the integrated monitoring activities is to: a) improve early intervention results and functional outcomes for all AzEIP eligible children and their families; and b) ensure that each EIP meets the requirements under IDEA, Part C with a particular emphasis on those requirements that are closely related to improving early intervention results for eligible children. In that regard, DES/AzEIP carries out general supervision activities through the implementation and oversight of the following:

- (1) State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR);
- (2) Annual 618 reports;
- (3) AzEIP Policies and Procedures and Effective Implementation (which includes Inter- and Intra- Agency Agreements and the Comprehensive System of Professional Development);
- (4) Data Processes and Results;
- (5) Integrated Monitoring Activities;
- (6) Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions;
- (7) Effective Dispute Resolution;
- (8) Technical Assistance System and Professional Development; and
- (9) Fiscal Management.

The monitoring and dispute resolution components include multiple mechanisms to identify and correct noncompliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and state requirements while facilitating continuous improvement. These methods and strategies are interrelated and integrated and, as a whole, ensure that the local EIPs are in compliance with the IDEA and improving results for children and their families.

Effective monitoring strategies are integrated across all components of the general supervision system to ensure data collection from early intervention programs on all SPP indicators, which includes both quantitative and qualitative indicators. The integrated monitoring activities include: collection, review and analysis of an EIP's data on related requirements and state identified priority areas. AzEIP's integrated monitoring activities are: (a) multi-faceted, seeking to improve both compliance and program performance; and (b) coordinated with its other systems, including the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development and the Technical Assistance System.

The integrated monitoring activities are inclusive of the following data sources: self-report activity data, when applicable (each EIP is required to participate in self-reporting activities during a three-year cycle), electronic data, outcomes data, dispute resolution data (formal complaints) and fiscal data. Collectively, the data reviewed and analyzed covers the indicators included in the SPP/APR.

AzEIP's integrated monitoring activities include annual review and analysis of data for each EIP across multiple data sources for the purposes of (a) identifying and correcting noncompliance, (b) improving performance, (c) selecting programs for on-site monitoring visits, (d) making local program determinations, (e) identifying technical assistance and training priorities, (f) completing the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and (g) identifying and highlighting program strengths and innovative practices.

DES/AzEIP reviews and verifies each EIP's data annually which includes: self-report activity data from a specified period of time; electronic data from a specified period of time; Child and Family Outcome data; and dispute resolution data. EIPs have the opportunity to ensure their data are complete and accurate. DES/AzEIP runs a final report for the purpose of monitoring to identify noncompliance. Programs are selected for participation in the self-reporting process based on multiple factors, including, but not limited to: date last monitored; most recent review of electronic data and dispute resolution data; correction of noncompliance; geographic location of the EIP; and program size to ensure each area of the state and varying program sizes are included. Programs participating in self-reporting do so on a three-year cycle at a minimum, or more frequently if required by DES/AzEIP. DES/AzEIP confirms receipt of all required documentation and notifies programs of the files selected for verification. Programs submit data for verification to DES/AzEIP. The files are then reviewed by DES/AzEIP staff who verifies timeliness, completeness and accuracy of the data submitted.

In addition, DES/AzEIP conducts annual fiscal monitoring that addresses the use of federal and/or state funds as well as the timeliness and accuracy of billing by the AzEIP service providing agencies, and third party payors. Based on the review and analysis of all data sources, DES/AzEIP issues written notification to each EIP within 90 days of completion that includes findings of noncompliance, required corrective action, the decision for an onsite visit by the AzEIP office and the EIP's local determination.

Selection of EIPs for onsite visits is based on multiple factors including, but not limited to: the extent and level of the EIPs compliance and noncompliance; recurring noncompliance; program practices; recency of the last onsite visit; and local determinations. EIPs can be selected for an onsite visit outside of the annual cycle, if necessary.

Each EIP receives an on-site visit during a three-year cycle. The focus of the onsite visit is to review existing data and gather additional data needed to determine the root cause(s) of the noncompliance, utilizing the Local Contributing Factor tool, and meaningful improvement strategies to correct the noncompliance and improve outcomes for children and families. If noncompliance is identified through the dispute resolution processes, AzEIP notifies the EIP within 90 days, providing the finding of noncompliance and required corrective actions.

Based on the extent and level of the EIP's non-compliance, and the identified root causes, each EIP is required to

implement corrective actions to ensure correction of noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the date of the written notification issued by DES/AzEIP.

Corrective action must include benchmarks, appropriate activities and timelines to address the contributing factors to ensure timely correction of the noncompliance. As outlined in the OSEP 09-02 Memo, DES/AzEIP requires EIPs to submit documentation of child specific correction and subsequent correction for each area of noncompliance for verification of the correction and subsequent implementation of the regulatory requirement. DES/AzEIP ensures that identified noncompliance is corrected as soon as possible and no later than one year from the identification of the noncompliance, by providing EIPs with support offered through its technical assistance system.

DES/AzEIP provides AzEIP Service Providing Agencies, and their employees and subcontractors, with a range of assistance to improve results and compliance. Technical assistance (TA) and capacity building activities include: written documents; coaching and in-service trainings; web-based information sharing; and local, regional or statewide meetings/conferences. If non-compliance is not corrected within one year of the written finding, the EIP is placed on a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) which identifies timelines, required TA and possible sanctions that may be imposed. Sanctions include, limiting referrals, withholding whole or partial payment until satisfactory resolution of default/noncompliance, and, if necessary, steps toward contract termination.

DES/AzEIP makes a performance determination for each EIP on an annual basis using data from the prior fiscal year, including the most recent data from the APR. DES/AzEIP notifies the EIP in writing of its determination and required actions, when applicable. DES/AzEIP makes local EIP determination and summary information available to the public by posting the determination for each EIP on its website. DES/AzEIP may also distribute local determination information to the Interagency Coordinating Council and other stakeholder groups.

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

Technical Assistance System:

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

The purpose of the AzEIP Technical Assistance System (AzEIP TA) is to provide guidance and assistance to enhance knowledge, confidence, and performance of IDEA, Part C, AzEIP policies and procedures, and State initiatives. As an interagency initiative, it directly responds to system needs identified through the Continuous Monitoring and Quality Improvement System, the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development and identified State initiatives. TA is provided through a variety of ways to ensure that the assimilation and application of information is practiced by the broad early intervention community. The overall goal of the TA system is to provide programs the opportunity to enhance their confidence and competence in providing early intervention supports and services in accordance with federal law and AzEIP policies and procedures and to collaborate with other early childhood programs.

AzEIP oversees the AzEIP TA system that supports the AzEIP community throughout the state. The AzEIP TA system is linked to other early childhood TA systems in other state agencies that support practitioners to support all infants and toddlers and their families and/or those that specialize in supporting infants and toddlers with developmental delays and disabilities. The primary recipients of technical assistance resources include: early intervention personnel, including service coordinators, therapists, and developmental specialists; early intervention administrators, including supervisors and management staff from AzEIP participating agencies; families; other early childhood community partners; and primary

referral sources, including but not limited to, physicians, Head Start Programs and the Department of Child Safety (DCS).

TA is available and provided in the following ways: written materials, such as IFSP Guidance Document, AzEIP Fidelity Checklist; in person during site visits; coaching in person, by telephone, e-mail, consultation in person, and occasional video conferencing; in-service trainings; regional/topical workshops; statewide workshops, conferences, or meetings; and web-based information sharing. AzEIP sets TA priorities for the State based upon: IDEA, Part C priorities; State initiatives, State monitoring findings; and current research findings.

DES/AzEIP ensures the evaluation of the TA system by the reviewing the following: short-term impact assessment obtained through immediate participant feedback, evaluation of intermediate and long-range impact on agencies and programs through a review and comparison of monitoring and system data to determine progress and identify potential changes, and analysis of TA services requested and provided on a regular basis. The office includes the results of these items, as appropriate, in federal, state, and local reporting; agency and contractor reporting during monitoring activities; and while analyzing reports with regard to TA provided to support programs to bring areas of noncompliance into compliance through the use of corrective actions.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

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

DES/AzEIP coordinates and maintains a comprehensive system of personnel development known as the AzEIP Professional Development, Learning and Sustainability System, which directly coordinates with the General Supervision System and the Technical Assistance System. The AzEIP Professional Development, Learning and Sustainability System includes: personnel training to implement innovative strategies and activities for the recruitment and retention of early intervention service providers; promoting the preparation of early intervention service providers who are fully and appropriately qualified to provide early intervention services in AzEIP; provider training to coordinate transition services for eligible children and their families from early intervention to an early childhood program, including preschool, Head Start or other community programs; and personnel training to support families in participating fully in the development and implementation of the Individualized Family Service Plan.

In addition, DES/AzEIP collaborates with other training systems, such as Arizona’s Parent Training and Information Center (Raising Special Kids) and other early childhood education agencies to ensure training of families and other stakeholders on the provisions of IDEA, Part C.

The general supervision of the comprehensive system of personnel development includes:

1. DES/AzEIP monitors compliance with the Professional Development, Learning and Sustainability System requirements through the General Supervision System and implements Corrective Action Plans when a program or agency has not complied with the requirements.
2. AzEIP’s Technical Assistance System also coordinates with the Professional Development, Learning and Sustainability System, providing ongoing guidance and assistance to early intervention professionals to enhance their knowledge, confidence, and performance.

The AzEIP Professional Development System promotes varied approaches to extend the appropriate knowledge, skills,

and understanding of AzEIP to pre-service professional preparation programs. The AzEIP Professional Development System provides technical assistance and guidance to assist universities and college programs to successfully integrate the identified requirements for professional knowledge, skills, and understanding of AzEIP into course work and curricula.

The Personnel Qualifications Policy applies to personnel who are providing early intervention services to children and their families. The personnel qualifications include two components: educational qualifications and the Standards of Practice and are established for the following personnel categories: core team members: developmental special instructionists; occupational therapists; physical therapists; and speech-language pathologists; Service Coordinators; and other team members: psychologists, social workers, and other Part C early intervention service providers.

The State of Arizona maintains professional licensure, certification, and/or registration for many of the disciplines used in the provision of early intervention services. This licensure, certification, and/or registration are independent of AzEIP. Specific qualifications for each discipline are outlined in chapter seven of the AzEIP Policies and Procedures.

The AzEIP Standards of Practice describes the basic knowledge required to provide early intervention services. The knowledge component involves individuals demonstrating knowledge in three content areas which provides a foundation for early intervention practice. The implementation of early intervention knowledge by the core team members, service coordinators and other team members is overseen by DES/AzEIP through the integrated monitoring activities of the General Supervision system. Through review of data, interviews, observations, self-report and onsite activities, DES/AzEIP assesses the skills of early intervention professionals and implements the appropriate technical assistance and program improvement activities to ensure compliance and performance requirements are met.

Service Coordinators and core team members demonstrate knowledge in the following content areas: foundations of the Arizona Early Intervention Program (includes the AzEIP mission and key principles, and laws and policies that govern AzEIP); initial Eligibility and Ongoing Functional Assessment (includes the determination of eligibility, the difference between evaluation and assessment and how to collect information to facilitate planning meaningful child and family assessment in natural environments); development and implementation of the Individualized Family Service Plans (includes an introduction to the IFSP process, a description of how to develop and review the IFSP, and providing evidence-based early intervention services using an adult interaction style known as coaching). Coaching uses a process of inquiry and personal discovery to build the coachee's level of awareness and responsibility and provides the coachee with structure, support and feedback. By acting as coaches, early intervention professionals can offer primary caregivers a more structured system for jointly planning new learning, modeling effective practices, and engaging in feedback according to Shelden and Rush.

Service Coordinators and core team members demonstrate knowledge by completing the AzEIP modules for the content areas and have three years from the date of hire into early intervention in Arizona to complete the knowledge components of the Standards of Practice. Other team members may complete the Standards of Practice, but are not required to do so. After completion of the knowledge component of the Standards of Practice, a Certificate of Completion for the Standards of Practice will be issued to the individual, a copy of which must remain in the individual's personnel file. DES/AzEIP's oversight of the implementation of early intervention practice by core and other team members is ongoing as part of its General Supervision requirements.

AzEIP programs or contractors maintain personnel files for their employees or contractors who provide early intervention services to document that they meet all current professional and AzEIP personnel qualifications. Early intervention professionals are responsible for knowing and complying with the AzEIP personnel qualifications as provided in these policies. All AzEIP service providing agencies are required to ensure that early intervention professionals complete the DES required trainings, and meet the AzEIP personnel qualifications, such as having Standards of Practice certificates in the individual's personnel file. Such information may be reviewed at any time as part of AzEIP's integrated monitoring activities.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part C results indicators

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

DES/AzEIP and its Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) have established an annual cycle to engage stakeholders in the preparation of Arizona’s Annual Performance Report (APR) under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

Each November, the regularly scheduled ICC meeting is replaced by a DES/AzEIP stakeholder meeting. Notification of the stakeholders meeting is sent out to the ICC members, the ICC Committee members and the broader early intervention community. The focus of the annual meeting is to review and discuss current State Performance Plan targets and stakeholders are provided an opportunity to propose changes to, or accept the current targets. The DES/AzEIP office staff then adjusts the targets to include proposed and agreed upon changes. The most current stakeholder meeting occurred on November 13, 2015. Progress on all indicators was discussed, and stakeholders did not recommend making changes to any current targets. Stakeholders also discussed reasons for identified low performance, and recommended improvement activities that have been considered and, as appropriate, incorporated into the APR.

A draft of the APR was posted on the AzEIP website in January 2016 for review and public input.

On January 08, 2016, DES/AzEIP presented the final APR data and improvement strategies and described its progress and slippage, to the ICC. The ICC voted to certify the APR at that time. DES/AzEIP will post the final APR and SPP on its website at www.azdes.gov/AzEIP.

In addition to having Arizona stakeholders review and revise the draft APR, DES/AzEIP received helpful reviews from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA), the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO), and the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy).

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

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

DES/AzEIP annually reports to OSEP and to the public on the information required by section 618 of IDEA at the times and in the manner specified by OSEP. The reports are known as Arizona’s 618 Reports. DES/AzEIP establishes procedures to be used by EIPs to collect, maintain, and transmit required state and federal information for the 618 Reports. DES/AzEIP uses data for its reporting requirements, which include: SPP/APR; 618 data (child count, settings, exit, and dispute resolution data); local reporting; and local determinations.

Arizona reports annually to the public on performance of each local EIP on indicators one through eight, as applicable, from the SPP as compared to the state's targets for these indicators. Arizona reports to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days from its submission of its annual performance report to OSEP. DES/AzEIP reports include the most recent performance data on each local EIP and the date the data were obtained. The local report is available through public means, including posting on the AzEIP website, distributed to local EIPs, and to the media. It is also accessible to individuals with disabilities and understandable to the public.

The Arizona Early Intervention Program has a website that is part of the Department of Economic Security's website. The website is a content management system that is updated regularly by the DES Public Information Office. The Annual Performance Report is posted each February as soon as it has been reviewed and approved by the ICC and has been submitted to the Federal government. This annual process will continue unaltered to assure that the data is available to the public.

The state changed the definition of an early intervention program and awarded all new contracts for early intervention services in the middle of FFY 2012, and was able to provide aggregate data for statewide performance as required in the federal report. Past public reporting was posted by county further delineated by service providing agency. With the new definition, and new contract structure occurring in the middle of the year, data could not be appropriately disaggregated in a public reporting format by each early intervention program. FFY 2013 data is currently available on the website.

DES/AzEIP posts the final APR and SPP, 618 reports, program determinations and the central registry on its website at www.azdes.gov/AzEIP.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 1: Timely provision of services

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		48.00%	67.00%	71.00%	97.00%	84.00%	78.00%	78.00%	87.00%	82.19%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
202	286	82.19%	100%	74.83%

Explanation of Slippage

Arizona considers timely services to be services initiated no later than 45 days from the date when the parent consents to IFSP services. The verification of data submitted by cycle two monitoring participants revealed that initial services most likely not to be provided within the required timeline for timely services were services required to be provided by Occupational Therapists and Physical Therapists. Occupational Therapists did not provide timely service initiation for 52 percent of the required services when Occupational Therapy was listed on the IFSP, while Physical Therapists did not provide timely service initiation for 95 percent of the required services when Physical Therapy was listed on the IFSP. This aligns with a review of capacity levels related to having fully staffed teams by early intervention service providers, as the most likely roles to be vacant on teams are those of Occupational and Physical Therapists. Services by Speech Language Therapists were the third leading services to not meet the regulation for providing timely services, although the services were eventually provided.

TBEIS contractors report that there is a shortage of available Occupational and Physical Therapists for hire throughout the state. This shortage impacts the ability of all team members to provide services in a timely manner due to increased and unbalanced caseloads. Staff from the AzEIP office discussed and confirmed this shortage exists in all aspects of services provision throughout the state and across all age ranges, whether through the early intervention program, school districts, Medicare providers or other service providing agencies and impacts capacity for providing these services to all Arizona residents.

During the April 1, 2015 through June 30, 2015 report period 3,727 infants and toddlers were referred to the Arizona Early Intervention Program. Of those referred, 32 percent (1,194/3,727) were found eligible for services. For the first time ever, AzEIP served more than 2.09 percent of the birth to age three population, which further contributed to slower service provision due to the increased and unbalanced caseloads.

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

12

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

- State monitoring
- State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

Data reviewed includes State monitoring data for Early Intervention Programs in the second year of a three year cycle, and includes initial IFSPs written from April 1, 2015 through June 30, 2015. There were 286 individual child records with new services for the 15 EIPs participating in the second year of the monitoring cycle during the given time frame. Timely services data were reported to the AzEIP office by each EIP, the AzEIP staff and DDD liaisons followed the submission with a verification review of ten percent of the IFSP records included in this count.

The State of Arizona uses a three-year monitoring cycle requiring self-reporting followed by validation. Programs represented in this year’s cycle (cycle two, or the second year in the three-year cycle) provide services to children and their families in multiple areas of the State including urban, rural and tribal areas. The monitoring cycle was developed by the AzEIP office staff and considered the following factors: most recent review of electronic data and dispute resolution data; correction of noncompliance; geographic location; and program size to ensure each area of the state and varying program sizes are included in each year of the three year cycle for the self-reporting requirement.

Programs represented in this year’s cycle (cycle two, or the second year in the three-year cycle) provide services to children and their families in multiple areas of the State including urban, rural and tribal areas. Cycle two consists of 15 Early Intervention Programs located across eight of the 22 regions throughout the State of Arizona.

Individual results from these cycle two participants, grouped by compliance levels, are detailed in the table below:

Compliance Level	Number of Programs
100%	2
90% - 99%	3
80% - 99%	3
70% - 79%	3
60% - 69%	3
50% - 59%	0
0% - 49%	1

The EIP with the lowest compliance level is located in the metropolitan Phoenix area in a multi-contractor region. No services from a Physical Therapist were initiated within the definition of timely services for this EIP which resulted in an extremely low level of compliance overall for this indicator, while the other contractor within that same region achieved an overall 80 percent compliance level, while still having a lower level of compliance for initiation of services by a Physical Therapist.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	0	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

During FFY 2013 there were four findings of noncompliance across four separate early intervention programs identified through the dispute resolution process between July 1, 2013 and June 30, 2014. These findings were identified under new statewide contracts effective in March of 2013 for 41 new early intervention programs. As part of the States' investigation process for each complaint, the State found all four of the findings to be isolated incidents, therefore the early intervention programs were required to correct each individual case of noncompliance but were not required to verify subsequent correction for other children.

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

To ensure correction of child-specific noncompliance, the State verified at 100%, the provision of services for each child, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the AzEIP program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In all instances, the newly assigned contractor provided the services, although late or provided additional compensatory services. This was verified through a review of instances of service delivery entered into the data system, subsequent to their provision, or through a review of service delivery notes if the service delivery was not yet entered into the data system.

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			86.00%	88.00%	90.00%	92.00%	94.00%	87.00%	88.00%	89.00%
Data		86.00%	84.00%	63.00%	76.00%	74.00%	86.00%	93.00%	94.00%	94.67%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	90.00%	91.00%	92.00%	93.00%	94.50%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Arizona set targets for FFY 2013 through FFY 2018 for all indicators during an ICC stakeholder meeting on November 7, 2014. Each November, the regularly scheduled ICC meeting is replaced by a DES/AzEIP stakeholder meeting. Notification of the stakeholders meeting is sent out to the ICC members, the ICC Committee members and the broader early intervention community. The focus of the annual meeting is to review and discuss current State Performance Plan targets and stakeholders are provided an opportunity to propose changes to, or accept the current targets. The DES/AzEIP office staff then adjusts the targets to include proposed and agreed upon changes. The most current stakeholder meeting occurred on November 13, 2015. Progress on all indicators was discussed, and stakeholders did not recommend making changes to any current targets.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	5,267	
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	5,363	

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data

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

intervention services in the home or community-based settings				
5,267	5,363	94.67%	90.00%	98.21%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A1	2008	Target ≥						62.00%	63.00%	64.00%	64.00%	65.00%
		Data					62.00%	65.00%	61.40%	71.60%	68.00%	71.73%
A2	2008	Target ≥						57.00%	57.50%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%
		Data					57.00%	64.00%	60.00%	60.80%	58.00%	55.36%
B1	2008	Target ≥						71.00%	72.00%	73.00%	73.00%	73.00%
		Data					71.00%	73.00%	70.00%	76.60%	73.00%	74.70%
B2	2008	Target ≥						49.00%	49.50%	50.00%	50.00%	50.50%
		Data					49.00%	57.00%	54.20%	57.10%	55.00%	54.71%
C1	2008	Target ≥						71.00%	72.00%	73.00%	72.00%	73.00%
		Data					71.00%	75.00%	70.70%	75.60%	71.00%	75.90%
C2	2008	Target ≥						52.00%	52.50%	53.00%	53.00%	50.50%
		Data					52.00%	56.00%	52.30%	58.70%	57.00%	53.58%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	65.00%	65.50%	65.50%	70.00%	74.00%
Target A2 ≥	58.00%	58.50%	58.50%	58.50%	59.00%
Target B1 ≥	73.00%	73.00%	73.50%	73.50%	74.00%
Target B2 ≥	50.50%	50.50%	51.00%	51.00%	51.50%
Target C1 ≥	73.00%	73.00%	73.50%	73.50%	74.00%
Target C2 ≥	50.50%	51.00%	51.50%	52.00%	52.50%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

Prepopulation of FFY 2018 Target A2 did not occur. Data entered reflects the target that should have populated based on prior submission of targets.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ICC's Collaboration and Education Committee, scheduled to meet every other month, serves as the regular meeting for

Stakeholders as it relates to the Practices strand of the SSIP and Indicators Three and Four. The ICC specifically analyzed the data and technical assistance activities for Indicator Three during the November, January and May meetings. These meetings, combined with the quarterly EIP State Leader’s meeting, kept the focus on improving the percentage of exiters that are included in the Indicator Three data.

The AzEIP Staff met with the Arizona ICC in January 2014 to set new targets for this indicator. Arizona ICC members had a lengthy discussion about the targets. Arizona ICC members and AzEIP Staff are cognizant of the fact that these ratings appear similar to past ratings, and further that Arizona has exceeded these targets; however, the data quality issues must be taken into consideration as low numbers can result in wide variability. Further, Arizona anticipates that ratings will be affected by an “implementation dip” as early intervention practitioners learn how to determine ratings with improved reliability. As a result of this discussion, stakeholders agreed that setting the targets lower for FFY 2014-2016 is appropriate, with improved results to be expected in FFY 2017 and 2018. EIP providers in the SSIP regions participating in the first phase, provide services to 40 percent of the total census of children served. Arizona expects that improvements made in the identified regions will result in increased outcomes statewide.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	3355.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	21.00	0.83%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	536.00	21.27%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	621.00	24.64%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	812.00	32.22%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	530.00	21.03%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	1433.00	1990.00	71.73%	65.00%	72.01%
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	1342.00	2520.00	55.36%	58.00%	53.25%

Explanation of A2 Slippage

Slippage is noted for A2, the percent of children who were functioning within age expectations for social relationships by the time they exited. The target for this outcome is 58 percent and the actual data is 53.25 percent. This indicator includes data for 2520 exiters, a 300 percent increase over historic reporting trends. LA Staff analyzed the data to determine if fewer of the children in category A(c) were AzEIP-only eligible, than those who were also eligible for the Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD) and/or also eligible for the Arizona State School’s for the Deaf and the Blind (ASDB), and compared this to the other two outcomes. The hypothesis was that children who are DDD-eligible either have a

diagnosis or are at-risk for cerebral palsy, cognitive/intellectual disability, autism or epilepsy and might be more likely to be determined to have social relationships at a level nearer to same-aged peers but not reach the level comparable to same-aged peers.

The analysis revealed that a significantly higher percentage of DDD eligible children were determined to have demonstrated improved social relationships that were nearer to their same-aged peers, but not at a level comparable to same aged peers, and a significantly lower percentage of DDD eligible children were determined to have social relationships at a level comparable to same-aged peers. After this analysis the LA Staff has determined that providing additional training to early intervention professionals on determining ratings at entry and exit is needed.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	24.00	0.95%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	455.00	18.06%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	686.00	27.23%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	974.00	38.67%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	380.00	15.09%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	1660.00	2139.00	74.70%	73.00%	77.61%
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	1354.00	2519.00	54.71%	50.50%	53.75%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	21.00	0.83%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	502.00	19.90%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	809.00	32.07%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	923.00	36.58%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	268.00	10.62%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	1732.00	2255.00	75.90%	73.00%	76.81%
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the	1191.00	2523.00	53.58%	50.50%	47.21%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).					

Explanation of C2 Slippage

Slippage is noted for C2, the percent of children who were functioning within age expectations for use of appropriate behaviors to meet needs, by the time they exited. The target for this outcome is 50.5 percent and the actual data is 47.2 percent. This indicator includes data for 2523 exiters, a 300 percent increase over historic reporting trends. An analysis of this data appears to confirm a previous hypothesis that as the quantity of data improved AzEIP Staff would have to provide additional technical assistance to EIPs around the quality of the rating determination process.

AzEIP Staff and stakeholders analyzed the data to determine if fewer of the children in category C (c) were AzEIP-only eligible, than those who were also eligible for the Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD) and/or also eligible for the Arizona State School’s for the Deaf and the Blind (ASDB), and compared this to the other two outcomes. The hypothesis was that children who are DDD-eligible either have a diagnosis or are at-risk for cerebral palsy, cognitive/intellectual disability, autism or epilepsy and might be more likely to be determined to use appropriate behavior to meet needs at a level nearer to same-aged peers but not reach the level comparable to same-aged peers.

The analysis revealed that a significantly higher percentage of AzEIP-only children were determined to have demonstrated appropriate behaviors to meet needs that were nearer to their same-aged peers, but not at a level comparable to same aged peers, and a significantly lower percentage of AzEIP-only children were determined to have maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers when using appropriate behaviors to meet needs.

AzEIP Staff and stakeholders determined that additional training to staff on determining ratings at entry and exit would assist in addressing this slippage. AzEIP Staff received permission from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center to use the Child Outcomes Summary Module as an in-person training and to assess learner’s acquisition of knowledge and skills as a result of participating in on-site trainings. During FFY 2015 AzEIP Staff will provide training and technical assistance to EIPs to improve their ability to more accurately and collaboratively determine entry and exit indicators.

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? Yes

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

To determine Arizona’s Child Outcomes Data, Arizona adopted the Early Childhood Outcomes Center’s (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF) 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. Arizona approved certain broad spectrum tools that ensure all areas of development are assessed, and that have been cross-walked by the ECO Center. Arizona incorporated the ECO calculator tool into the I-TEAMS data system.

AzEIP Staff undertook multiple steps to support EIPs to increase the percentage of children for whom entry and exit indicators are reported including meeting with the EIP State Leaders committee. The EIP State Leaders committee, comprised of program managers from TBEIS providers across the state, District Program Managers and Supervisors from DDD, Supervisors from ASDB and AzEIP Staff meet quarterly. These individuals are responsible individually and collectively for supervising early intervention professionals and for ensuring their implementation of both compliance and

performance items. Many of these participants also provide direct services to children and their families. AzEIP Staff met with EIP state leaders and reviewed historic data trends and asked the State Leaders to set a target for the percent reported for FFY 2014. The EIP State Leaders set a target of reporting entry and exit indicators for 40 percent of those children who exited during FFY 2014. Monthly reports were sent to EIPs to ensure timely entry of data. Technical assistance was provided to EIPs to assist them to review their data and to analyze any trends relative to data quality, out of range values and any other identified data trends. In addition, emails were sent directly to early intervention practitioners to assist them to determine entry and exit indicator ratings, with families.

Reporting on 54 percent of the children exiting during FFY 2014, Arizona has once again significantly increased the percentage of children for whom entry and exit indicators are reported, far surpassing the target set by the EIP State Leaders. **For FFY 2014, Arizona is reporting on 2,519 of the 4,589 children who exited, or 54 percent of all exiting children.**

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2006	Target ≥					91.00%	91.50%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	94.00%
		Data			94.00%	96.70%	95.00%	95.00%	94.00%	97.00%	95.27%	97.50%
B	2006	Target ≥					91.00%	91.50%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.50%
		Data			95.00%	95.20%	94.70%	94.00%	94.00%	95.00%	96.30%	95.01%
C	2006	Target ≥					91.00%	91.50%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.50%
		Data			96.00%	97.40%	96.70%	96.00%	95.00%	97.00%	96.93%	98.40%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%	94.50%
Target B ≥	93.50%	94.00%	94.50%	95.00%	95.50%
Target C ≥	94.00%	94.50%	95.00%	95.50%	96.25%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ICC's Collaboration and Education Committee meets every other month and serves as the regular meeting for Stakeholders as it relates to the Practices strand of the SSIP and Indicators Three and Four. The ICC specifically analyzed the data and technical assistance activities for Indicator Four during the November, January and May meetings. The AzEIP Staff met with the Arizona ICC in January 2014 to set new targets for this indicator.

The EIP State Leaders committee, comprised of program managers from TBEIS providers across the state, District Program Managers and Supervisors from DDD, Supervisors from ASDB and AzEIP Staff meets quarterly. These individuals are responsible individually and collectively for supervising early intervention professionals and for ensuring their implementation of both compliance and performance items. Many of these participants also provide direct services to children and their families. AzEIP Staff met with EIP state leaders and reviewed historic data trends and asked the State Leaders why they believed the family survey data was so low. The ICC and EIP State Leaders reviewed the Part C SPP/APR Indicator Analysis for this indicator. The national average of family surveys returned for analysis was 1030. The average of states' response rates was 39.9 percent. Arizona has historically received 400 to 600 family surveys each year. Given the number of children and families served each year, the number of annual IFSP meetings and the number of children exiting each year, the group agreed that the number of returned surveys is low. Initially many respondents posited that it was the length of the survey. When informed that over 24 states use the NCSEAM family survey, the group

determined that changing surveys might not result in improved results.

In preparing data for stakeholder review for the SSIP, AzEIP Staff noted that they could not disaggregate data by EIP as the form had not been updated during FFY 2013 to reflect the statewide implementation of TBEIS. Additionally, service coordinators were not consistently noting the Region or the TBEIS provider and/or agency by eligibility. AzEIP Staff updated the form in February 2015 to ensure that service coordinators can accurately record the TBEIS provider and the agency for whom the child has been determined eligible (DDD, ASDB, or AzEIP-only). Staff expected that this would allow disaggregation of Family Outcomes data moving forward. Additionally, service providers indicated that the race and ethnicity section of the survey was confusing for service coordinators to complete. A review of data confirmed the provider’s concerns. As a result the race and ethnicity section was revised to promote accurate collection of data.

AzEIP Staff took the aforementioned steps to support EIPs to increase the percentage of children for whom family surveys are completed. This also included providing pre-filled surveys to EIPs to ensure that data could be disaggregated by DDD, ASDB or AzEIP-only eligibility, by county, and by race and ethnicity. AzEIP Staff also began providing monthly tallies to the field, noting the number of children who exited during the month and the number of annual IFSPs, thus identifying the number of surveys that were to be disseminated in a given month and comparing that with the number of returned surveys. Unfortunately, these actions did not result in use of these pre-populated surveys nor did it result in an increase in returns.

AzEIP Staff then surveyed other states that also utilize the NCSEAM family survey, to determine how they increased their return rate. States reported using a specific month, e.g., April, and targeting dissemination of the family survey to families who have had an IFSP for at least six months. One state reported a 65 percent return rate, while another reported a 35 percent return rate. AzEIP Staff again met with the EIP State Leaders and the ICC to develop a plan to increase the percentage of family surveys returned. AzEIP Staff propose to pilot with a number of programs the use of a one-month window (April) to disseminate and collect family surveys during FFY 2015 to increase the return rate of family surveys.

The State expects that this change will increase the number of surveys accurately completed and returned.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent families participating in Part C	549.00
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	515.00
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	540.00
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	500.00
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	530.00
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	514.00
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	537.00

	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	97.50%	94.00%	95.37%
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	95.01%	93.50%	94.34%

	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	98.40%	94.00%	95.72%

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

DES/AZEIP used the NCSEAM 6-point rating scale. The percentage reported for each of the sub-indicators equals the percent of families who rated a four or higher. Each Service Coordinator hand delivers a copy of the survey as part of the Annual Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) meeting and at transition from early intervention. The AZEIP service coordinator completes the demographics portion of the survey prior to providing the survey (with a postage prepaid envelope) to the family. The AZEIP service coordinator may be employed by an AZEIP contractor, DES/Division for Developmental Disabilities (DDD) or the Arizona State Schools for the Deaf and the Blind (ASDB). Regardless of which agency the AZEIP service coordinator is employed by, they are required to provide each family with a family survey after each annual IFSP meeting and at transition from DES/AZEIP.

The AZEIP Family Surveys are delivered by hand to the family by the Service Coordinator, then returned by the families through mail using an AZEIP provided postage-paid and addressed envelope. Once the AZEIP office receives the survey, the response data is entered into an Access database that does not interface with the I-TEAMS data system. As a result, DES/AZEIP is not able to directly compare the number of surveys received with the number of surveys disseminated, or the race, ethnicity or county of residence of the child and family. However, DES/AZEIP analyzed the surveys received by race, ethnicity and county of residence by comparing that data to the 618 data and the previous year's survey data to determine whether the data received was representative of the children served.

Family Outcomes data is derived as a result of Family Surveys which are completed annually and at transition by families of children enrolled in AZEIP. Arizona, reports to OSEP on the percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family to know their rights, effectively communicate their children's needs, and help their children develop and learn. AZEIP uses the NCSEAM 6-point rating scale for families to identify their agreement with the aforementioned required questions as well as 22 additional questions. Each service coordinator hand delivers a copy of the survey, along with a postage-paid envelope, as part of the Annual IFSP meeting and at transition from early intervention. The AZEIP service coordinator may be employed by an AZEIP contractor, DES/Division for Developmental Disabilities or the Arizona State Schools for the Deaf and the Blind. The AZEIP service coordinator completes the demographics portion of the survey prior to providing the survey to the family.

The survey is then mailed by the family using a provided, postage-paid envelope to the AZEIP state office, where state staff enters the survey data into an Access database. The family survey data elements have not yet been incorporated into I-TEAMS. These data are the only data that continue to be entered and housed in a separate data system that is not connected to the complete child record. AZEIP analyzed the surveys by ethnicity, for surveys received and compared that data to previous year's data to determine that the data received was representative of the children served.

In preparing data for stakeholder review as part of the Statewide Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) or Indicator 11, AZEIP Staff noted that they could not disaggregate data by EIP as the form had not been updated during FFY 2013 to reflect the statewide implementation of TBEIS. Additionally, Service Coordinators were not consistently noting the Region or the TBEIS provider and/or agency by eligibility. Based on these facts, the AZEIP Staff and stakeholder groups determined there was not a feasible way to focus on family outcomes for the SSIP since there was no way to disaggregated the data with any semblance of data quality. The AZEIP Staff updated the form in February 2015 to ensure that service coordinators can accurately record the TBEIS provider and the agency for whom the child has been determined eligible (DDD, ASDB, or AZEIP-only). This will allow disaggregation of Family Outcomes data moving forward. Additionally, service providers indicated that the ethnicity/race section of the survey was confusing for service coordinators to complete.

A review of data confirmed the provider’s concerns. As a result the ethnicity/race section was also revised .

Not all families provided a response to all questions, however; DES/AzeIP received a total of 549 surveys in FFY 2014. AzEIP Staff compared the reported ethnicity and race in the completed surveys to the 618 data reported to OSEP and the breakdown of children served by county to analyze the representativeness of the family surveys. The FFY 2014 family survey data for race, ethnicity and county are similar to that reported in past years.

Ethnicity	618 Data (2014)	AZ Survey Data	+/-
American Indian	6.40%	3.28%	-3.12
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.1	1.82%	0.28
Black or African American	5.40%	3.46%	-1.94
Hispanic or Latino	3.00%	9.65%	+6.65
White	82.30%	56.10%	-26.2

County	Percent of Children served as of 10/1/14	Percent of Surveys returned by county FFY 2014	
Apache	0.90%	0.55%	-0.35
Cochise	1.10%	3.28%	+2.18
Coconino	1.60%	2.91%	+1.31
Gila	0.70%	0.91%	+0.21
Graham	0.80%	0.00%	-0.25
Greenlee	0.20%	0.00%	-0.20
La Paz	0.10%	0.55%	+0.45
Maricopa	64.70%	56.28%	-8.42
Mohave	1.80%	6.56%	+4.76
Navajo	0.90%	1.46%	+0.56
Pima	12.40%	7.10%	-5.3
Pinal	7.10%	6.74%	-0.36
Santa Cruz	0.90%	0.00%	-0.90
Yavapai	2.10%	5.28%	+3.18
Yuma	1.80%	2.55%	+0.75

While the responses are representative for most ethnicities, and counties, the overall low response rate is concerning. To address this, AzEIP Staff met with EIP state leaders and reviewed historic data trends and asked the State Leaders why they believed the family survey data was so low. As reported in the FFY 2013 APR/SPP, DES/AzeIP is not able to compare the number of surveys received with the number of surveys disseminated as the two data systems (Access database and I-TEAMS) are not linked.

The ICC, EIP State Leaders and Stakeholders reviewed the Part C SPP/APR Indicator Analysis for this indicator. The national average of family surveys returned for analysis was 1030. The average of states’ response rates was 39.9 percent. Arizona has historically received 400 to 600 family surveys each year. Given the number of children and families served each year, the number of annual IFSP meetings and the number of children exiting each year, the group agreed that the number of returned surveys is low. Initially many respondents posited that it was the length of the survey. However, when

informed that over 24 states use the NCSEAM family survey, the AzEIP office staff and stakeholders determined that changing surveys might not result in improved results.

In preparing data for stakeholder review for the SSIP, AzEIP Staff noted that they could not disaggregate data by EIP as the form had not been updated during FFY 2013 to reflect the statewide implementation of TBEIS. Additionally, service coordinators were not consistently noting the Region or the TBEIS provider and/or agency by eligibility. The AzEIP Staff updated the form in February 2015 to ensure that service coordinators can accurately record the TBEIS provider and the agency for whom the child has been determined eligible (DDD, ASDB, or AzEIP-only). It was expected that this would allow disaggregation of Family Outcomes data moving forward. Additionally, service providers indicated that the ethnicity/race section of the survey was confusing for service coordinators to complete. A review of data confirmed the provider's concerns. As a result the ethnicity/race section was also revised.

AzEIP Staff took the aforementioned steps to support EIPs to increase the percentage of children for whom family surveys are completed. This included providing surveys with specific pre-populated fields to EIPs to ensure that data could be disaggregated by DDD, ASDB or AzEIP-only eligibility, by county and by race and ethnicity. AzEIP Staff also began providing monthly tallies to the field, noting the number of children who exited during the month and the number of annual IFSPs. This communication helped identify the number of surveys that were to be disseminated in a given month and allowed comparison of the number of disseminated surveys with the number of returned surveys. Unfortunately, these actions did not result in use of these pre-populated surveys nor did it result in an increase in returns.

AzEIP Staff then surveyed other states that also utilize the NCSEAM family survey, to determine how they increased their return rate. States reported using a specific month, e.g., April, and targeting dissemination of the family survey to families who have had an IFSP for at least six months. One state reported a 65 percent return rate, while another reported a 35 percent return rate. AzEIP Staff again met with the EIP State Leaders and the ICC to develop a plan to increase the percentage of family surveys returned. AzEIP Staff propose to pilot with a number of programs the use of a one-month window (April) to disseminate and collect family surveys during FFY 2015 to increase the return rate of family surveys.

It is expected that this will increase the number of surveys completed and returned.

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No



Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State



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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

In the FFY 2014 APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2014 data are from a group representative of the population, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

OSEP noted that the State reported data for the indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population and noted the State included strategies and improvement activities to address the issue in the future.

As noted on the data page, the State determined that subsequent FFY 2014 data were representative of the population.

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			0.67%	0.70%	0.74%	0.77%	0.80%	0.62%	0.63%	0.64%
Data		0.59%	0.60%	0.60%	0.56%	0.53%	0.67%	0.72%	0.77%	0.76%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	0.65%	0.66%	0.67%	0.68%	0.69%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Arizona set targets for FFY 2013 through FFY 2018 for all indicators during an ICC stakeholder meeting on November 7, 2014. Each November, the regularly scheduled ICC meeting is replaced by a DES/AzeIP stakeholder meeting. Notification of the stakeholders meeting is sent out to the ICC members, the ICC Committee members and the broader early intervention community. The focus of the annual meeting is to review and discuss current State Performance Plan targets and stakeholders are provided an opportunity to propose changes to, or accept the current targets. The DES/AzeIP office staff then adjusts the targets to include proposed and agreed upon changes. The most current stakeholder meeting occurred on November 13, 2015. Progress on all indicators was discussed, and stakeholders did not recommend making changes to any current targets. Therefore, the targets remain as initially submitted.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	766	null
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013	4/3/2014	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	85,876	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

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

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
766	85,876	0.76%	0.65%	0.89%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			1.65%	1.72%	1.80%	1.88%	1.95%	1.84%	1.86%	1.87%
Data		1.61%	1.81%	1.81%	1.84%	1.72%	1.95%	1.84%	1.98%	1.94%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	1.87%	1.88%	1.88%	1.89%	1.89%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Arizona set targets for FFY 2013 through FFY 2018 for all indicators during an ICC stakeholder meeting on November 7, 2014. Each November, the regularly scheduled ICC meeting is replaced by a DES/AzeIP stakeholder meeting. Notification of the stakeholders meeting is sent out to the ICC members, the ICC Committee members and the broader early intervention community. The focus of the annual meeting is to review and discuss current State Performance Plan targets and stakeholders are provided an opportunity to propose changes to, or accept the current targets. The DES/AzeIP office staff then adjusts the targets to include proposed and agreed upon changes. The most recent stakeholder meeting occurred on November 13, 2015. Progress on all indicators was discussed, and stakeholders did not recommend making changes to any current targets. Therefore, the targets remain as initially submitted.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	5,363	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013	7/2/2015	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	256,785	

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth	Population of infants and toddlers	FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2014
--------------------------------------	------------------------------------	----------	----------	----------

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

to 3 with IFSPs	birth to 3	Data*	Target*	Data
5,363	256,785	1.94%	1.87%	2.09%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		39.00%	59.00%	63.00%	72.00%	85.00%	98.00%	97.30%	95.00%	75.85%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
644	1,194	75.85%	100%	88.61%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline)	414
--	-----

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

- State monitoring
- State database

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

Data for this indicator represents collection of Initial IFSP data for all children referred to, and found eligible for services from the Arizona Early Intervention Program between April 1, 2015 and June 30, 2015.

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

The data accurately reflects statewide data for FFY 2014. It includes all children referred, eligible, and with IFSPs developed statewide during that timeframe as children are born and enter the Early Intervention System at various times throughout the year.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Accounting for Untimely Evaluations:

During the April 1, 2015 through June 30, 2015 report period 3,727 infants and toddlers were referred to the Arizona Early Intervention Program. Thirty-two percent (1,194/3,727) were found eligible for services. Of the 1,194 children found eligible, 95 percent (1,140/1,194) had timely evaluations/eligibility conducted within 45 days of referral, when analyzed separate and apart from the time line for initial IFSP completion. Fourteen percent (171/1,194) of all eligible children had evaluation delays due to family circumstances, and these children are included in the numerator and the denominator of the calculation. AzEIP verified through review of subsequent data that all children for whom an evaluation was required had an evaluation subsequently completed, although late.

Reasons for eligibility/evaluation delay are documented in the child's record and reported in the data system. Fifty-four eligible children had untimely evaluations. This number does not include children for whom the reason for delay was reported as family circumstances. The following provides the reasons and associated number of children for those with a delay other than family circumstances: 19 instances of team related issues; 15 instances related to IDEA parent identification for children covered under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA); 10 instances related to untimely receipt of requested medical records or documentation and 10 instances classified as other, and one due to weather or natural disaster.

Accounting for Untimely IFSPs:

During the same time period, 89 percent (1,058/1,194) of all eligible children had timely IFSP development completed within 45 days of referral. Of those, 16 percent (190/1,194) of all eligible children had delays due to family circumstances, and these children are included in the numerator and the denominator for the final compliance calculation. AzEIP verified through review of subsequent data that all children for whom an IFSP was required had an IFSP subsequently completed, although late.

Reasons for IFSP delay are documented in the child's record and reported in the data system. One Hundred Ninety-Two eligible children had untimely IFSP development. This number does not include children for whom the reason for delay was reported as family circumstances. The following provides the reasons and associated number of children for those with a delay other than family circumstances: 81 instances where the delay reason was not reported; 58 instances related to team issues; 17 instances related to CAPTA issues, 12 instances related to medical record receipt issues and 23 instances classified as other, and one due to weather or natural disaster.

Thirty-one of the 41 EIPs were found in noncompliance of the regulation. The following table provides overall compliance levels grouped by percentage across the state. Twenty of the 41 EIPs reached a high level of compliance for this requirement by achieving a compliance level of 95 percent or higher. The six EIPs with the lowest level of compliance are located in areas of the state with identified team capacity challenges, which impacted their ability to meet the requirements of the program. Of those where noncompliance was discovered, 14 were identified as having continuing noncompliance from FFY 2013.

Compliance Level Achieved	Number of EIPs with Timely IFSP
100%	10
>95%	10
90% - 95%	4
80% - 89%	11

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

70% - 79%	5
<70%	1

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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



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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		80.00%	91.00%	96.00%	100%	100%	96.00%	89.00%	70.00%	56.69%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

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

Yes

No

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
227	286	56.69%	100%	79.37%

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

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

State monitoring



State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

The State of Arizona uses a three-year monitoring cycle requiring self-reporting followed by validation for indicators that are not yet captured in the statewide data system. Programs represented in this year's cycle (cycle two, or the second year in the three-year cycle) provide services to children and their families in multiple areas of the State including urban, rural and tribal areas. We included multiple factors in our decision of which EIPs would participate in the self-reporting process during each year within the cycle. These factors included, but were not limited to: most recent review of electronic data and dispute resolution data; correction of noncompliance; geographic location; and program size to ensure each area of the state and varying program sizes are included in each year of the three year cycle for the self-reporting requirement.

Programs represented in this year's cycle (the second year in the three-year cycle) provide services to children and their families in multiple areas of the State including urban, rural and tribal areas. Cycle two consists of 15 Early Intervention Programs located across eight of the 22 regions throughout the State of Arizona.

The data gathered for this indicator is related to children who turned two years nine months old between April 1, 2015 and June 30, 2015, as the timeliness requirement is that the transition is completed no later than 90 days prior to the child's third birthday.

 Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Of the 286 toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B, 224 had a transition planning meeting with an IFSP with documented transition steps and services at least 90 days before the child's third birthday. There were no instances of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Data reported for FFY 2014 is from the second year of the three year Self-Reporting cycle. Transition data were submitted to the State by the 15 EIPs in the cycle. All but one of the 15 EIPs were found to be in noncompliance as they did not achieve 100 percent compliance. Noncompliance was due to instances of the transition planning meeting not being held in a timely manner as well as transition planning steps not being entered on the IFSP. No family delays were documented for transition planning meetings. Of the total transition planning meetings held in a timely manner, 49 did not contain documentation of the transition planning steps on the IFSP, which negatively impacted the compliance level achieved by individual EIPs. Another 13 meetings were not completed within the time line to meet compliance requirements. Documentation of a combined transition planning meeting and transition conference impacted by exceptional family circumstances was not evident.

Notifications of noncompliance and corrective action plans are being sent to 14 of the 15 EIPs, as only one EIP was able to achieve 100 percent compliance with the transition planning meeting requirements. One EIP in particular had very low compliance for documenting the Transition Steps on the IFSP with the first EIP documenting only 3 of 19 records.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		89.00%	68.00%	88.80%	100%	84.00%	87.00%	76.00%	30.00%	69.57%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

- Yes
- No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
208	286	69.57%	100%	86.31%

Number of parents who opted out (this number will be subtracted from the number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B when calculating the FFY 2014 Data)	45
---	----

Describe the method used to collect these data

Data is collected through a self-reporting process for EIPs participating in integrated monitoring activities between April 1,

2015 and June 30, 2015, followed by a validation by LA Staff and DDD Liaisons of ten percent of the data submitted to ensure accuracy of the reported data. The State plans to expand the reporting period from the current one quarter time frame to an entire year approach capturing transition activity data beginning July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016 which will be reported in February of 2017.

This year, AzEIP began the process of providing notification to the State Education Agency (SEA) in instances where the family did not choose to exercise their right to opt out of notification and Public Education Agency (PEA) Notification was sent to the Local Education Agency (LEA) by the EIP. This was done in order to support EIPs in their level of compliance as this part of the process has been challenging for providers to complete in accordance with program requirements. Effective July 1, 2015, the revised transition policy went into effect and AzEIP began sending notification to the SEA for all EIPs.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? Yes

Is the policy on file with the Department? Yes

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

- State monitoring
- State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

The State of Arizona uses a three-year monitoring cycle requiring the submission of Self-Reporting data followed by validation for indicators that are not yet captured in the statewide data system. Programs represented in this year's cycle (Cycle two, or the second year in the three-year cycle) provide services to children and their families in multiple areas of the State including urban, rural and tribal areas. Cycle two consists of 15 Early Intervention Programs located across eight of the 22 regions throughout the State of Arizona. The data gathered for this indicator is related to children who turned two years nine months old between April 1, 2015 and June 30, 2015, as the timeliness requirement is that the transition is completed no later than 90 days prior to the child's third birthday.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Of the 286 infants and toddlers exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B, there were 208 instances where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday. There were also an additional 45 documented instances where families opted out of the PEA Notification process and these instances are included in the calculation of the compliance percentage

Fourteen of the 15 EIPs who participated in this year's self-reporting component of the integrated monitoring activities were found to be in noncompliance. Ten of the remaining EIPs achieved between 80 percent and 95 percent compliance, while 4 achieved compliance below 80 percent. Of those with lower levels of compliance a lack of data entry regarding the parent's decision related to opting out of notification coupled with historically low compliance providing notification to the SEA were found to be contributing factors.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		57.00%	67.00%	100%	100%	82.00%	82.00%	77.00%	64.00%	70.34%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

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

- Yes
- No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
180	286	70.34%	100%	80.85%

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference (this number will be subtracted from the number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B when calculating the FFY 2014 Data)	51
---	----

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B)

10

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

- State monitoring
- State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

The State of Arizona uses a three-year monitoring cycle requiring Self-Reporting followed by validation for indicators that are not yet captured in the statewide data system. Programs represented in this year's cycle (cycle two, or the second year in the three-year cycle) provide services to children and their families in multiple areas of the State including urban, rural and tribal areas. We included multiple factors in our decision of which EIPs would participate in the self-reporting process during each year within the cycle. These factors included, but were not limited to: most recent review of electronic data and dispute resolution data; correction of noncompliance; geographic location; and program size to ensure each area of the state and varying program sizes are included in each year of the three year cycle for the self-reporting requirement.

Programs represented in this year's cycle (cycle two, or the second year in the three-year cycle) provide services to children and their families in multiple areas of the State including urban, rural and tribal areas. Cycle two consists of 15 Early Intervention Programs located across eight of the 22 regions throughout the State of Arizona.

The data gathered for this indicator is related to children who turned two years nine months old between April 1, 2015 and June 30, 2015, as the timeliness requirement is that the transition is completed no later than 90 days prior to the child's third birthday.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Of the 286 toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B, 180 had a transition conference meeting IFSP requirements at least 90 days before the child's third birthday. There were ten instances of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances. An additional 51 families did not provide approval to convene the IFSP transition conference.

Data reported for FFY 2014 is from the second year of the three year Self-Reporting cycle. Transition data were submitted to the State by the 15 EIPs in the cycle. All but one of the 15 EIPs were found to be in noncompliance as they did not achieve 100 percent compliance. Noncompliance was due to instances of the transition conference not being held in a timely manner as well as a lack of documentation the meeting was held.

Notifications of noncompliance and corrective action plans are being sent to 14 of the 15 EIPs, as only one EIP was able to achieve 100 percent compliance with the transition planning meeting requirements. Seven EIPs achieved less than 80 percent compliance for this requirement. Factors related to low compliance for these EIPs include: lack of proper documentation and rescheduling meetings outside of time line requirements to meet school district requests.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data:

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

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥					

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Arizona Part C Program has not adopted the Arizona IDEA, Part B dispute resolution process, therefore this indicator is N/A. Unfortunately at the time of submission, and despite several attempts, the GRADS 360 system would not save the selection of N/A for this indicator.

Prepopulated Data

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 10: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥					

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The state had no mediation requests during FFY 2014, therefore no targets are required.

Prepopulated Data

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014
Target		65.00%
Data	65.00%	

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	65.55%	65.50%	70.00%	70.00%

Key:

Description of Measure

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Overview

Data Analysis

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

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

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

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

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

Statement

Description

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

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

Theory of Action

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

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

 Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Infrastructure Development

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

Please see attachments for all sections of the Arizona SSIP Phase II

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

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

Evaluation

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

Technical Assistance and Support

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

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

This indicator is not applicable.