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

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

The Arizona Department of Economic Security (DES) awarded 42 new Team-Based Early Intervention Services (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., Applied Behavioral Analysis, nutrition, assistive technology). The new contracts are administered by DES/Arizona Early Intervention Program (AzEIP) and serve all families and their children, birth to three years of age, who are eligible for services funded by the Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD), Arizona State Schools for the Deaf and the Blind (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 also launched a new 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 EIP

An Early Intervention Program (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 Division of Developmental Disabilities (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.

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 data, when applicable (each EIP is required to complete a Self-Report 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 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 correct. 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 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 non-compliance; 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.

EIPs selected for a site review, who have not submitted a Self-Report within the three year cycle, are required to complete and submit Self-Reporting data prior to the onsite visit. Each EIP receives an onsite visit on 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 nonccompliance, 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 Annual Performance Report. 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 determinations information to the Interagency Coordinating Council and other stakeholder groups.

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 videoconferencing; 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 following: short-term impact assessment through immediate participant feedback; evaluation of intermediate and long-range impact on agencies and programs, including the review and comparison of monitoring data to determine progress and identify potential changes; analysis of TA services requested and provided on a regular basis for inclusion, as appropriate, in federal, state, and local reporting; agency and contractor reporting in monitoring activities on the efficacy of TA; and analyzing close out reports with regard to TA provided in areas that came into compliance.

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 preservice 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.

Stakeholder Involvement:

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.).

On November 7, 2014 DES/AzEIP held a stakeholder meeting in place of the regular ICC Committee meetings. Notification of the stakeholders meeting was sent out to the ICC members, the ICC Committee members and the broader early childhood community. The focus of the meeting was on setting targets for 2013 through 2018 as well as a review of initial monitoring results for Indicator 8A, IFSP Transition Steps and Services, Indicator 8B, PEA Notification and Indicator 8C, Transition Conference. Stakeholders discussed reasons for 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 2015 for review and public input.

On January 09, 2015, DES/AzEIP presented the final APR data and improvement strategies 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).

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2012 performance of each LEA 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.

Indicator 1: Timely provision of services

Historical Data and Targets

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

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

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Indicator 1: Timely provision of services

FFY 2013 Data

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)

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	4,932	466

Explanation of Alternate Data

Data reviewed includes State Monitoring data for Early Intervention Programs in the first year of a three year cycle, and includes IFSPs written from April 1, 2014 through June 30, 2014, with a new service, whether due to an initial IFSP, a six month review or an annual review. There were 466 individual child records with new services for the 14 EIPs participating in the first year of the monitoring cycle through Self-Reporting data during the given timeframe. Timely services data were gathered manually using the Child File Review Sheet for timely IFSP services.

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
383	466	87.00%	100%	82.19%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

** FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.*

Explanation of Slippage

The State did not meet its target of 100 percent for FFY 2013 and experienced slippage from FFY 2012 results. The data from FFY 2012 included a very small number of children reported (70) due to the fact only three of the smaller EIPs remained in the third year monitoring cycle and is considered an anomaly in the results because of that fact. When comparing FFY 2013 results to FFY 2011 results, the FFY 2013 represents a continued positive trend over time.

In accordance with the measurement table, the 63 documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances are included in both the numerator and the denominator and therefore are not listed in the box below to ensure accuracy of the calculation for compliance.

Of the 14 EIPs participating in the self-reporting process, six achieved 90 percent to 100 percent compliance, three achieved 80.4 percent to 86.5 percent compliance, while the remaining five EIPS achieved between 53.2 percent and 79.2 percent compliance. When researching contributing factors to this low percentage, 66 records did not include documentation validating exceptional family circumstances initially reported as the reason for the delay. Had those records contained appropriate documentation, the State would have been able to report 449 instances of timely provision of services which would have resulted in a compliance level of 96.35 percent. In addition to the 66 records which did not contain adequate documention of exceptional family circumstances, there were 17 documented instances of system delays.

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be subtracted from the total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs when calculating the FFY 2013 data)	

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.

AzEIP's integrated monitoring system is inclusive of a three year Self-Report process to gather data that is not yet available in the state's database from each Early Intervention Program (EIP) on a three year cycle. Data reported for FFY 2013 was from the first year of the three (3) year cycle. Timely services data were gathered manually using the Child File Data Sheet for Timely IFSP Services from 14 Early Intervention Programs (EIPs) in nine regions throughout the state in urban, rural and tribal areas.

Data reviewed includes IFSPs written from April 1, 2014 through June 30, 2014, with a new service, whether due to an initial IFSP, a six month review or an annual review. There were 466 individual child records with new services for those EIPs participating in the Self-Reporting process during the given timeframe. The State reviewed and verified the data and issued determination letters to participating Early Intervention Programs in the winter of 2014, which included 13 findings of noncompliance related to this indicator as one EIP achieved 100 percent compliance.

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

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

☐ **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Indicator 1: Timely provision of services

Required Actions from FFY 2012

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)

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Indicator 1: Timely provision of services

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

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)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The three EIPs who were cited for noncompliance based on FFY 2012 data are no longer in existence to verify the EIP was implementing the regulatory requirements in ensuring all IFSP services are provided timely.

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

Although the three programs ceased to exist, AzEIP ensured correction of child-specific noncompliance by validating that all of the infants and toddlers who were still in the jurisdiction of AzEIP recieved their services, although late. AzEIP verified this through a review of submitted documentation of the actual start date for each service for the children who did not receive timely IFSP services.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Historical Data and Targets

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

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

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	89.00%	90.00%	91.00%	92.00%	93.00%	94.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On November 7, 2014 DES/AzEIP held a stakeholder meeting in place of the regular ICC Committee meetings. Notification of the stakeholders meeting was sent out to the ICC members, the ICC Committee members and the broader early intervention community. The focus of the meeting was on setting targets for 2013 through 2018 with meeting participants discussing the proposed targets then suggesting changes or accepting the targets as proposed. The DES/AzEIP office staff then adjusted the targets to include proposed and agreed upon changes.

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

FFY 2013 Data

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)

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	4,669	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	4,932	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
4,669	4,932	94.00%	89.00%	94.67%	Met Target	No Slippage

** FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.*

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Required Actions from FFY 2012

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)

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Historical Data and Targets

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)

Historical Data

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

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

Explanation of Changes

FFY 2012 Target data did not prepopulate.

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	65.00%	65.00%	65.50%	65.50%	70.00%	74.00%
Target A2 ≥	58.00%	58.00%	58.50%	58.50%	58.50%	59.00%
Target B1 ≥	73.00%	73.00%	73.00%	73.50%	73.50%	74.00%
Target B2 ≥	50.50%	50.50%	50.50%	51.00%	51.00%	51.50%
Target C1 ≥	73.00%	73.00%	73.00%	73.50%	73.50%	74.00%
Target C2 ≥	50.50%	50.50%	51.00%	51.50%	52.00%	52.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On November 7, 2014 DES/AzEIP held a stakeholder meeting in place of the regular ICC Committee meetings. Notification of the stakeholders meeting was sent out to the ICC members, the ICC Committee members and the broader early intervention community. The focus of the meeting was on setting targets for 2013 through 2018 with meeting participants discussing the proposed targets then suggesting changes or accepting the targets as proposed. The DES/AzEIP office staff

then adjusted the targets to include proposed and agreed upon changes.

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes
FFY 2013 Data

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)

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	

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

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

	Number of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	12
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	254
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	288
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	387
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	300

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	675	941	68.00%	65.00%	71.73%	Met Target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	687	1,241	58.00%	58.00%	55.36%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

** FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.*

Explanation of A2 Slippage

In March of 2013, DES/AzEIP implemented Team Based Early Intervention Services (TBEIS); this required the enactment of new contracts statewide and the transfer of over 4,000 children from existing programs to 41 new contractors within early intervention programs, a 42nd contractor was added in October, 2013. The new contracts are designed to improve not only compliance but also improve outcomes for families and children. DES/AzEIP revised its policies and procedures during FFY 2011 to reflect changes to the assessment and transition process as required under the revised IDEA regulations. Additionally, DES/AzEIP implemented a new web-based data collection system, which included the Child Outcomes Indicator data.

The move to an integrated web-based application has greatly improved Arizona's data collection on this indicator. Historically, Arizona has utilized multiple data systems to derive the data for completing the APR/SPP process. For this indicator, service coordinators have historically been required to submit the completed Entry and Exit Indicators to the state office to have the data entered into a stand-alone data system. With the implementation of the new data system in

the spring of 2013, service coordinators and/or data entry staff enter the data directly into the system. This data is then connected to other data points, including but not limited to Initial IFSP, exit and transition data. Arizona has generally reported on an average of 798 children in the child outcomes report, or fewer than 20 percent of all children exiting during a fiscal year. In contrast, this year Arizona is able to report on 1,243 children or 30 percent of the 4,171 children who exited during the reporting period. This represents a 166 percent increase over the previous number of children for whom child outcome indicators were reported.

Arizona met its targets for Outcome B-1, exceeded the targets set for Outcome B-1 and B-2 and Outcome C-1 and C-2. Arizona experienced slippage on the target set for Outcome A-2, [Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program] by 2.64 percent. It is essential to note that Arizona's data quality is much improved and as a result more accurately representative of the children served in Arizona. Arizona has made substantial progress in ensuring that the number of children for whom child outcome indicators are reported are more representative of the children for whom services are provided across the state annually. The previous targets were set using a smaller sample of children and it is possible that given Arizona's narrow eligibility, that target was set too high. Additionally, in reviewing the data in preparation for the development of Arizona's State Systemic Improvement Plan, stakeholders reported that determining entry and exit ratings for social-emotional outcomes was of particular concern. Program Managers, Supervisors and Service Coordinators identified a need for training and support to utilize assessments that are more sensitive to social and emotional development in infants and toddlers to determine child outcome ratings for this indicator. Improving social emotional outcomes for children will be the focus of Arizona's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) under Indicator 11, and therefore, Arizona will be making concerted efforts to improve results on this indicator over the next five years or over the course of the SSIP.

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

	Number of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	8
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	248
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	307
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	449
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	231

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	756	1,012	73.00%	73.00%	74.70%	Met Target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	680	1,243	55.00%	50.50%	54.71%	Met Target	No Slippage

** FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.*

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	10

	Number of Children
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	245
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	322
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	481
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	185

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	803	1,058	71.00%	73.00%	75.90%	Met Target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	666	1,243	57.00%	50.50%	53.58%	Met Target	No Slippage

** FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.*

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? No

Provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" and list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Arizona adopted the Early Childhood Outcomes Center's (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form and renamed it the Child Indicator Summary Form (CISF). Minor adaptations were made to the form to capture necessary demographic information, combine data tables, and change the ratings from numbers to letters so children would not be rated a high or low number. Arizona approved certain broad spectrum tools that ensure all areas of development are assessed, and have been cross-walked by the ECO Center. Programs may choose any tool on the following list:

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Required Actions from FFY 2012

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)

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 APR.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Progress data is reported under the section titled FFY 2013 Data , while actual target data is reported under the section titled Historical Data and Targets for this indicator.

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Historical Data and Targets

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2006	Target ≥				91.00%	91.50%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%
		Data		94.00%	96.70%	95.00%	95.00%	94.00%	97.00%	95.27%
B	2006	Target ≥				91.00%	91.50%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%
		Data		95.00%	95.20%	94.70%	94.00%	94.00%	95.00%	96.30%
C	2006	Target ≥				91.00%	91.50%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%
		Data		96.00%	97.40%	96.70%	96.00%	95.00%	97.00%	96.93%

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

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%	94.50%
Target B ≥	93.50%	93.50%	94.00%	94.50%	95.00%	95.50%
Target C ≥	93.50%	94.00%	94.50%	95.00%	95.50%	96.25%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On November 7, 2014 DES/AzEIP held a stakeholder meeting in place of the regular ICC Committee meetings. Notification of the stakeholders meeting was sent out to the ICC members, the ICC Committee members and the broader early intervention community. The focus of the meeting was on setting targets for 2013 through 2018 with meeting participants discussing the proposed targets then suggesting changes or accepting the targets as proposed. The DES/AzEIP office staff then adjusted the targets to include proposed and agreed upon changes.

Indicator 4: Family Involvement
FFY 2013 Data

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)

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent families participating in Part C	561
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	547
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	561
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	533
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	561
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	552
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	561

** FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.*

	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	95.27%	94.00%	97.50%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	96.30%	93.50%	95.01%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	96.93%	93.50%	98.40%	Met Target	No Slippage

** FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.*

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 or the Arizona State Schools for the Deaf and the Blind. 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.

DES/AzEIP is not currently able to compare the number of surveys received with the number of surveys disseminated as the legacy data system did not capture census data on the annual IFSPs, which is when the survey is provided to the family. However, DES/AzEIP analyzed the surveys by ethnicity, for whom surveys were received and compared that data to previous year's data to determine whether the data received was representative of the children it serves.

Not all families rated all questions, however; DES/AzEIP received a total of 561 surveys in FFY 2103. This is a 12.37 percent increase from the total of 501 surveys received in FFY 2012.

Representativeness:

Ethnicity	618 Data (2013) Number Reported	618 Data (2013) % of Total Reported	AZ Survey Data (2013) Number Reported	AZ Survey Data (2013) % of Total Reported	+/-
American Indian or Alaskan Native	249	5.05%	25	4.46%	-0.59%
Asian or Pacific Islander	84	1.78%	16	2.85%	+1.07%
Black or African American	147	2.98%	26	4.63%	+1.65%
Hispanic or Latino	1848	37.47%	126	22.46%	-15.01%
White	2503	50.75%	314	55.97%	+5.22%
Two or More	97	1.97%	13	2.31%	-0.34%
No response	0		41	7.31%	+7.31%
Total Number Reported	**4928**		**561**		

While the responses are representative for most ethnicities, there is an under representation from families identified as Hispanic or Latino when it comes to returning the family survey. The survey is available in both English and Spanish versions. The low survey response does not appear to be due to a language barrier in completing the survey in those families for whom English is not the primary language or show limited English proficiency. Upon further review of the process for completing and documenting the results of the surveys returned, discrepancies have been identified in both the survey collection tool and the manual data entry process for documenting information from the returned surveys.

The current survey collection tool incorrectly lists Hispanic or Latino as options under both race and ethnicity. This can lead to the following available combined categories: Hispanic/Latino and White, Hispanic/Latino and Black, Hispanic/Latino and American Indian or Alaskan Native, Hispanic/Latino and Asian or Pacific Islander, or Hispanic/Latino and Hispanic/Latino.

The access database used to enter the results of the returned surveys does not currently have separate race and ethnicity fields, which unfortunately led to the data entry clerk choosing one option for the family and not separating out the Hispanic or Latino field.

Based on these discrepanices, we cannot say with certainty that the numbers are truly representative of the race and ethnicity reported by the families who completed and returned the surveys. During FFY 2014, the AzEIP office staff will correct the discrepanices in the survey tool and the survey database to ensure race and ethnicity are appropriately captured and reported.

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

☐ **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Required Actions from FFY 2012

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)

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Historical Data and Targets

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		0.67%	0.70%	0.74%	0.77% ~~0.00%~~	0.80%	0.62%	0.63%
Data	0.59%	0.60%	0.60%	0.56%	0.53% ~~0.00%~~	0.67%	0.72%	0.77%

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

Explanation of Changes

Data for 2009 did not populate correctly and reflected 0.0 percent. The correction reflects actual targets and results previously reported for this indicator.

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	0.64%	0.65%	0.66%	0.67%	0.68%	0.69%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On November 7, 2014 DES/AzEIP held a stakeholder meeting in place of the regular ICC Committee meetings. Notification of the stakeholders meeting was sent out to the ICC members, the ICC Committee members and the broader early intervention community. The focus of the meeting was on setting targets for 2013 through 2018 with meeting participants discussing the proposed targets then suggesting changes or accepting the targets as proposed. The DES/AzEIP office staff then adjusted the targets to include proposed and agreed upon changes.

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

FFY 2013 Data

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)

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	645	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013	12/16/2014	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	84,900	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
645	84,900	0.77%	0.64%	0.76%	Met Target	No Slippage

** FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.*

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Required Actions from FFY 2012

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)

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Historical Data and Targets

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		1.65%	1.72%	1.80% ~~1.81%~~	1.88% ~~0.00%~~	1.95%	1.84%	1.86%
Data	1.61%	1.81%	1.81%	1.84%	1.72% ~~0.00%~~	1.95%	1.84%	1.98%

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

Explanation of Changes

Data pre-populated for this indicator was incorrect with a target of 0.0 percent for 2008 and target and actual results for 2009 also at 0.0 percent. The corrections reflect actual targets and data previously reported for this indicator.

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	1.87%	1.87%	1.88%	1.88%	1.89%	1.89%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On November 7, 2014 DES/AzEIP held a stakeholder meeting in place of the regular ICC Committee meetings. Notification of the stakeholders meeting was sent out to the ICC members, the ICC Committee members and the broader early intervention community. The focus of the meeting was on setting targets for 2013 through 2018 with meeting participants discussing the proposed targets then suggesting changes or accepting the targets as proposed. The DES/AzEIP office staff then adjusted the targets to include proposed and agreed upon changes.

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

FFY 2013 Data

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)

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	4,932	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013	12/16/2014	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	254,638	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
4,932	254,638	1.98%	1.87%	1.94%	Met Target	No Slippage

** FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.*

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Required Actions from FFY 2012

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)

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Historical Data and Targets

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

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

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

FFY 2013 Data

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)

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
1,024	1,350	95.00%	100%	75.85%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

** FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.*

Explanation of Slippage

Of the 1,350 eligible infants and toddlers, 1,024 had evaluation, assessment and IFSP completion within Part C's required 45 day timeline. There were 374 records of family circumstances delaying completion of the required activities. In accordance with the measurement table, we have included the 374 family circumstance records in both the numerator and denominator. They are not reflected separately in the specified box.

Explanation of slippage:

The new AzEIP data system launched April 2013 requires that a delay reason be entered if the evaluation/eligibility determination is not completed within 45 days of the referral date. At this time the system does not require that a delay reason be entered when evaluation/eligibility is completed timely but the IFSP is not timely. Due to this fact, the performance data for FFY 2013 is assumed to under represent performance in this indicator. While 100 percent of evaluation/eligibility records included delay reasons when the activity is not timely, only 70 percent of delayed IFSP meetings included a reason for delay. As a result, 30 percent of untimely IFSP meetings (205/694) did not have a reported reason for the delay. Many of these delays may have been the result of exceptional family circumstances. Had those records included an appropriate explanation of the reason for delay, we believe the results would reflect a higher level of compliance. AzEIP is currently in the process of developing and implementing the requirement to enter the reason for an IFSP delay to collect this data.

The table below provides numbers and percentages for reasons for the IFSP delays.

IFSP Delay Reason	Number	Percentage
Family	374	53.89%
Unknown	205	29.54%
System	115	16.57%
Total	694	

Additional data were reviewed to test the theory that the reason for slippage in this indicator is the lack of data on reasons for delay in IFSP meetings. There was no difference in the number of late IFSPs from FFY 2013 to these data in FFY 2014. The number of late IFSPs with unknown delay reasons has dropped by 50 percent and the number of reported family delay reasons has increased by 41 percent in the FFY 2014 data. This suggests the performance for this indicator for FFY 2013 is higher than we can currently document.

Across the State, there are many Service Coordinators new to both early intervention and IDEA reporting requirements related to timely IFSPs which has led to inconsistent data entry and documentation for IFSP delays. AzEIP provided mandatory Service Coordination training in the spring of 2014. This training included, among other IDEA requirements,

the service coordination requirements for ensuring timely IFSP development.

As this is the first full year of reporting under new EIPs that now combine AzEIP contractors, ASDB and DDD staff, new skills and strategies for collaboration are required between EIP team members in order to complete the IFSP timely and ensure documentation is collected and entered into the data system or other collection tools.

Forty of the 42 EIPS were cited for non-compliance. The following table provides a comparison of the overall percentage of timely eligibility vs. timely IFSP development for the 42 EIPs during an 18 month window from April 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014. Once the database requires entry of the reason for untimely IFSP development when the child's eligibility occurred in a timely manner, we are confident the results will be more reflective of the higher compliance level achieved for each of the past four reporting cycles (FFY 2009-FFY 2012).

Compliance Level Achieved	Number of EIPs with Timely Eligibility	Number of EIPs with Timely IFSP
100%	15	2
>95%	11	3
90%-95%	9	4
80%-89%	5	8
70%-79%	1	15
<70%	1	10

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be subtracted from the number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted when calculating the FFY 2013 Data)	

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).

State data system data for the time period April 1, 2014 through June 30, 2014 were used to report statewide compliance levels for the 45 day timeline for this APR.

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 2013. 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, 2014 through June30, 2014 report period, 95 percent (1,274/1,350) of all eligible children had timely evaluations/eligibility conducted within 45 days of referral, when analyzed separate and apart from the timeline for initial IFSP completion. Fourteen percent (187/1,350) of all eligible children had evaluation delays due to family circumstances, and these children are included in the numerator and the denominator of the calucation. AzEIP verified through review of

subsequent data that all children for whom an evalution 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. Seventy-one 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: 48 instances of team related issues; eight instances related to IDEA parent identification for children covered under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA); six instances related to untimely receipt of requested medical records or documentation and six instances classified as other.

Accounting for Untimely IFSPs:

During the April 1, 2014 through June 30, 2014 report period, 76 percent (1,024/1,350) of all eligible children had timely IFSP development completed within 45 days of referral. Fourteen percent(187/1,350) of all eligible children had delays due to family circumstances, and these children are included in the numerator and the denomintor of the 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. Three hundred twenty-six 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: 205 instances where the delay reason was not reported; 87 instances related to team issues; 14 instances related to CAPTA issues, eight instances related to medical record receipt issues and six instances classifed as other.

Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Required Actions from FFY 2012

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)

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

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)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
10	10		0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The State awarded and subsequently implemented all new early intervention contracts in the spring of 2013. As a result, the ten early intervention programs were no longer in existence to verify they were fully implementing the regulatory requirements in ensuring all children had timely evaluation, assessment and initial IFSP meeting.

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

Although the ten programs ceased to exist, AzEIP validated that all of the infants and toddlers who were still in the jurisdiction of the AzEIP program received thier initial IFSP, although late. AzEIP ensured that the EIP program completed the evaluation, assessment and initial IFSP for each child by reviewing subsequent data system records for each child who did not receive a timely evaluation, assessment and IFSP.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

Indicator 8: Early Childhood Transition

FFY 2013 Data

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)

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	254
Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	254

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

A child who is eligible for AzEIP and who has an IFSP when the child is two years of age or older is considered potentially eligible for Part B.

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Historical Data and Targets

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

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

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

FFY 2013 Data

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)

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
Indicator 8		Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	254	
Indicator 8		Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	254	

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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
144	254	70.00%	100%	56.69%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

** FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.*

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be subtracted from the number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C when calculating the FFY 2013 Data)	

Explanation of Slippage

Data reported for FFY 2013 was from the first year of the three year Self-Reporting cycle. Transition data were gathered manually using the Child File Review Sheet for Transition Planning for the 14 EIPs in the cycle.

All 14 EIPs were found to be noncompliant as none achieved 100 percent compliance. Noncompliance was due to documented 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, 46 did not contain documentation of the Transition Planning steps on the IFSP, which negatively impacted the compliance level by individual EIPs. 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 were sent to 11 of the 14 EIPs. Three EIPs are no longer in existence as they chose to terminate their contracts effective December 1, 2014.

Three EIPs in particular had very low compliance for documenting the Transition Steps on the IFSP with the first EIP documenting only 8 of 23 records, the second EIP documenting 0 of 14 records, and the third documenting 3 out of10.

A consistent pattern of having no documentation, or documentation on a document other than the IFSP has not yet been established by these EIPs when looking at individual service coordinator records, as the same service coordinators within an EIP had multiple records with both no documentation and documentation on items other than the IFSP.

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 one, or the first 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. As this is the first year of a brand new three year cycle with all new Early Intervention Programs we included multiple factors in our decision of which EIPs would participate in the self-reporting and validation requirements in the first year of the new 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 one, or the first 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 one consists of 14 Early Intervention Programs located across seven 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, 2014 and June 30, 2014, 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)**

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Required Actions from FFY 2012

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)

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

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)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The three EIPs who were cited for noncompliance based on FFY 2012 data are no longer in existence to verify the EIPs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements at 100 percent.

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

To ensure correction of child-specific noncompliance, the State verified that the EIPs developed an IFSP with transition steps and services for each child, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the AzEIP program (i.e., the child has exited the State's Part C program due to age or other reasons), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Historical Data and Targets

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

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

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

FFY 2013 Data

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)

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
Indicator 8		Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	254	

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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
160	254	30.00%	100%	62.99%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

** FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.*

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 2013 Data)	

Describe the method used to collect these data

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 one, or the first 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. As this is the first year of a brand new three year cycle with all new Early Intervention Programs we included multiple factors in our decision of which EIPs would participate in the Self-Reporting process and validation requirements in the first year of the new 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.

Cycle one consists of 14 Early Intervention Programs located across seven 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, 2014 and June 30, 2014, as the timeliness requirement is that the transition is completed no later than 90 days prior to the child's third birthday.

Fourteen of the 14 EIPs who participated in this year's self-reporting component of the integrated monitoring activities were found to be noncompliant. Individual EIP compliance for this indicator ranged from six percent compliance to 95 percent compliance. Notifications of noncompliance and corrective action plans were sent to 11 of the 14 EIPs. Three EIPs are no longer in existence as they chose to terminate their contracts effective December 1, 2014.

In accordance with directions in the measurement table, included in both the numerator and denominator above are 24 families who elected to opt-out of PEA notification and referral by the child's age of two years eight months in accordance with the State's opt-out policy.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? Yes

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Required Actions from FFY 2012

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)

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

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)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The three EIPs who were cited for noncompliance based on FFY 2012 data are no longer in existence to verify the EIPs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements at 100 percent.

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

To ensure correction of child-specific noncompliance, the State verified that the EIPs notified the PEA and SEA, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the early intervention program (i.e., the child has exited the State's Part C program due to age or other reasons), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Historical Data and Targets

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

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

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

FFY 2013 Data

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)

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
Indicator 8		Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	254	

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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
184	254	64.00%	100%	72.44%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

** FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.*

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 2013 Data)	
Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number also will be subtracted from the number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B when calculating the FFY 2013 Data)	

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

(●) State monitoring
( ) State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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 one, or the first 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. As this is the first year of a brand new three year cycle with all new Early Intervention Programs we included multiple factors in our decision of which EIPs would participate in the Self-Reporting

process and validation requirements in the first year of the new 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.

Cycle one consists of 14 Early Intervention Programs located across seven 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, 2014 and June 30, 2014, as the timeliness requirement is that the transition is completed no later than 90 days prior to the child's third birthday.

Fourteen of the 14 EIPs who participated in this year's submission of Self-Reporting data component of the integrated monitoring activities were found to be noncompliant. Individual EIP compliance for this indicator ranged from 40 percent compliance to 96 percent compliance. Notifications of noncompliance and corrective action plans were sent to 11 of the 14 EIPs. Three EIPs are no longer in existence as they chose to terminate their contracts effective December 1, 2014.

In accordance with directions in the measurement table, included in both the numerator and denominator above are 18 families who did not provide approval for the transition conference and an additional 17 documented delays due to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Required Actions from FFY 2012

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)

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

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)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The three EIPs who were cited for non-compliance based on FFY 2012 data are no longer in existence to verify the EIPs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements at 100 percent.

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

To ensure correction of child-specific noncompliance, the State verified that the EIPs held a transition conference, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the AzEIP program (i.e., the child has exited the State's Part C program due to age or other reasons), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Historical Data and Targets

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥								
Data								

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

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥						

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

FFY 2013 Data

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)

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/12/2013	3.1 Number of resolution sessions		
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/12/2013	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements		

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

3.1 Number of resolution sessions	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
					Incomplete Data	n/a

** FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.*

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Required Actions from FFY 2012

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)

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 10: Mediation

Historical Data and Targets

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥								
Data								

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

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥						

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Indicator 10: Mediation

FFY 2013 Data

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)

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1 Mediations held	0	

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0				Incomplete Data	n/a

** FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.*

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 10: Mediation

Required Actions from FFY 2012

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)

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Baseline and Targets

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.

Baseline Data

FFY	2013
Data	65.00%

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	65.00%	65.55%	65.50%	70.00%	70.00%

Description of Measure

This is a new indicator also known as the Statewide Systemic Improvement Plan. This indicator, although included in the APR package in the GRADS 360 reporting tool, is not due for final submission to OSEP until April 1, 2015 and is currently in development.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data Analysis

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.

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.

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Analysis of State Infrastructure

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.

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.

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Measurable Result for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities

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.

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

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

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.

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.

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Theory of Action

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.

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)

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

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

Selected: None Selected

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

Name:

Title:

Email:

Phone: