

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012**

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The Department of Economic Security, Arizona Early Intervention Program (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 September 13, 2013, DES/AzEIP presented to the ICC an overview of the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Plan (APR), including the components of the SPP/APR and the specific Indicators, measurements and data source(s).
- On November 8, 2013 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 Indicator 8A, IFSP Transition Steps and Services, 8B, PEA Notification and 8C, Transition Conference. Stakeholders discussed reasons for slippage, 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 for review and public input.
- On January 10, 2014, 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](http://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 Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center (MPRRC).

**Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments**

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

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

**Measurement:**  
 Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.  
 Account for untimely receipt of services, including the reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2012	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:**

87%
-----

AzEIP’s integrated monitoring system is inclusive of a three year Self-Report process to gather data from each Early Intervention Program (EIP) on a three year cycle that is not available through the states data system. Selection of EIPs for Cycle 3 self-report was based on the amount of time since the EIP was last monitored, review of available data through the State’s database, such as the 45 day timeline, and review dispute resolution data. The level and extent of compliance and noncompliance was factored into the selection process.

Timely services data reported for FFY 2012 was from the last three EIPs left in the three (3) year self-report cycle

Timely services data were gathered manually using the Child File Review Sheet for Timely IFSP Services from the only three Early Intervention Programs (EIPs) left in the three year cycle. Self-report data submitted and reviewed includes IFSPs written from July 1, 2012 through September 30, 2012, with a new service. The State reviewed and verified the self-report data and issued Determination letters in the spring of 2013, which included findings of noncompliance.

**Arizona’s definition of timely IFSP services:** All newly identified IFSP services must be provided within 45 days of the parent’s consent to the IFSP **OR**, if the planned start date is greater than 45 days from the parent’s consent, the service must start on or before the planned start date for that service. The denominator and numerator include children for whom the delay was due to exceptional family circumstances.

**Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive Early Intervention Services in a Timely Manner:**

A. Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.	61
B. Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs.	70
Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner (Percent = [(a) divided by (b)] times 100).	87%

Accounting for untimely services:

- For the three Early Intervention Programs who completed a Self-Report during FFY 2012, 87 percent (61/70) of the infants and toddlers received their IFSP services in a timely manner.
  - Twenty-five percent (15/61) of the infants and toddlers had timely service delays due to exceptional family circumstances. These infants and toddlers are included in the numerator and the denominator.
  - AzEIP verified documentation of the exceptional family circumstances through review of child files.
- Nine (9) infants and toddlers did not receive their IFSP services timely due to system delays.
  - Of those nine, 56percent (5/9) were due to the service coordinators, through the Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD), not being able to identify a provider through their qualified vendor network.
  - Thirty-three percent (3/9) did not have documentation of actual start dates in the child’s file
  - The remaining eleven percent (1/9) of the infants and toddlers that did not receive timely services was due to the DDD service coordinator not following the procedures for accessing services through the child’s Medicaid health plan.

- All of the infants and toddlers, who were still in the jurisdiction of the EIPs, received their IFSP services, although late. AzEIP verified this through review of submitted documentation of the actual start date for each service.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2012:**

The State did not meet its target of 100 percent for FFY 2012. However, Arizona made progress from the 78 percent compliance in FFY 2011 to 87percent compliance in FFY 2012.

The primary factor contributing to the noncompliance was due to the DDD service coordinators not consistently following the procedures DES/AzEIP put in place on November 1, 2011, to ensure all children received all of their IFSP services in a timely manner. The State implemented procedures, which require the DDD service coordinator to transfer the child to an AzEIP Team-based Early Intervention Services provider when they were unable to identify a provider to ensure all IFSP services were provided in a timely manner. These procedures were implemented because DDD is unable to require their qualified vendors to serve all children across all zip codes. However, the AzEIP Team-based Early Intervention Services (TBEIS) providers are required, under the Scope of Work, to serve all AzEIP only eligible children in their contracted region. The AzEIP TBEIS contracts were amended to require them to also serve all DDD eligible children when DDD is unable to provide the services through their qualified vendors.

In the nine instances of noncompliance, there was documentation that the service coordinators attempted to identify a provider through their qualified vendor system. However, there was no documentation that the DDD Service coordinators followed the timely services procedures. As a result, the infants and toddlers did not receive all of the IFSP services within a timely manner.

In May 2012, the Department of Economic Security (DES) issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) for team-based early intervention services. In November 2012, DES awarded 41 new team-based early intervention services 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. The contracts will be administered by the Department’s Arizona Early Intervention Program (DES/AzEIP) and serve all families and their children, birth to three years of age, who are eligible for the Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD), Arizona State Schools for the Deaf and the Blind (ASDB), and AzEIP (a.k.a. AzEIP-only). DDD and ASDB will 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 Department’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.

See attachment A for an additional description of the FFY 2012 Improvement Activities specifically implemented to address the issues related to timely provision of all IFSP services.

**Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100 percent compliance):**

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2011 for this indicator: 78 percent

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2011 (the period from July 1, 2011, through June 30, 2012).	8
2. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State verified as timely corrected (verified as corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding).	5
3. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)].	3

**Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):**

4. Number of FFY 2011 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	3
5. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	3
6. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

**Demonstrating Correction as outlined in 09-02 Memo**

**1. Accounting for All Instances of Noncompliance:**

- o The State accounted for all instances of noncompliance as identified through its Three Year Self-Report Cycle

**2. In FFY 2011 Noncompliance Occurred in 8 EIPs as Follows:**

Eight EIPs had noncompliance identified in 215/275 children (78 percent compliance). Eight (8) findings of noncompliance were issued.

- Root causes of the noncompliance in the five DDD EIPs included:
  - a. Policies and Procedures:
    - 1. Service coordinators, across each of the EIPs, did not have procedures for tracking each infant and toddler’s IFSP to ensure all IFSP services started within the required timelines.
  - b. Infrastructure:
    - 1. DDD qualified vendor process for identifying and accessing services does not require the vendors to serve all children. Interviews with the vendors revealed their decisions to serve children are based on zip codes, child’s diagnosis and available time slots rather on the IFSP needs for children.
    - 2. Availability of therapists in rural areas is limited.
- Root causes of the noncompliance in the three DES/AzEIP EIPs included:
  - a. In two of the EIPs, the service coordinators did not fulfill their responsibilities in ensuring the IFSP team members were aware of the dates services needed to be initiated.

- b. In one of the EIPs, the service provider was not available to start the services within the required timeline.

**3. To Address the Noncompliance, the State Required the EIPs to:**

- The DDD EIPs were required to identify additional service providers and to implement procedures for the service coordinator to track services needed and steps taken to ensure service providers are identified and initiate all IFSP services in a timely manner.
- Beginning November 1, 2011, DDD EIPs were required to implement the Timely Services Procedures when DDD was unable to provide IFSP services timely.
- The DES/AzEIP EIPs were required to develop a process, during weekly team meetings, to ensure the service coordinator and the other team members coordinated the start date of all IFSP services in a timely manner.

**4. Verification of Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance (either timely or subsequent):**

- Prong 1: To ensure correction of child-specific noncompliance, the State verified that all eight of the EIPs initiated services for each child, although late, by reviewing documentation submitted by the EIP that reflected the actual start date the service(s) were initiated for each child who did not receive timely provision of services.
- Prong 2: To ensure the program was correctly implementing the timely service provision requirements (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) in 34 CFR §§ 303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1) a subsequent follow up on-site review of child files with IFSPs with a new service was conducted by the AzEIP TAMS. Review resulted in five EIPs being at 100 percent compliance for timely provision of all IFSP services, indicating the program was implementing the timely service requirements. AzEIP implemented Team-based Early Intervention Contracts beginning March 1, 2013, which included the transition of nearly 4,000 children into new EIPs. The three remaining EIPs, who had not yet corrected noncompliance as of that date, are no longer in existence. All individual records for children who were with that EIP have been corrected, but the EIP is no longer in existence to verify correction of noncompliance at the program level.

**See Attachment A: Combined Improvement Activity Table**

**Additional Information Required by OSEP’s APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):**

Statement from the Response Table	State’s Response
Because the State reported less than 100 percent compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. The State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in the FFY 2011 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved	This information is included in the above description.

<p>100 percent compliance) based on updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.</p> <p>In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>	
---	--

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012**

Given the recent implementation of several significant improvement activities, including infrastructure changes and a web-based data system, the state determined there are no revisions at this time.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) FFY 2012

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Same description as included in Indicator #1.

**Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments**

**Indicator 2:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012	88%

**Actual Target Data for 2012:** 94 percent

During FFY 2012, 94 percent or 4772/5100 infants and toddlers in Arizona primarily received early intervention services in their home or community-based settings. The State of Arizona met its target for this indicator.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012:**

The State met its target: no explanation of progress/slippage or discussion about improvement strategies required.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2013:**

The State met its target: no explanation of progress/slippage or discussion about improvement strategies required.

## Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

## Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Same description as in Indicator #1

<b>Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments</b>
---

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

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

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

<b>Measurement:</b>
---------------------

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

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

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

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

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

times 100.

- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers =  $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \text{ times } 100.$
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers =  $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \text{ times } 100.$

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

**C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:**

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

**Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:**

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

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:** Percent =  $[\# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus } \# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in category (d)} \div [\# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus } \# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus } \# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus } \# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d)}] \text{ times } 100.$

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

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2:** Percent =  $[\# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus } \# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e)} \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)})] \text{ times } 100.$

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:

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

**Actual and Target Data for FFY 2012:**

Summary Statements	Actual FFY 2011 (% and # children)	Actual FFY 2012 (% and # children)	Target FFY 2012 (% of children)
<b>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)</b>			
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program.	65%	68% 383/560	64%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program.	58.5%	58% 429/746	58%
<b>Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)</b>			
1 Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program.	74%	73% 463/631	73%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they exited the program.	53.5%	55% 409/747	50%
<b>Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs</b>			
1 Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program.	74%	71% 432/608	72%

2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they exited the program.	<b>53.5%</b>	<b>57%</b> <b>423/747</b>	<b>53%</b>
---	--------------	------------------------------	------------

**Progress Data for Part C Children FFY 2012**

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning.	12	1.6%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	165	22.1%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach.	140	18.8%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	243	32.6%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	186	24.9%
Total	N= 746	100%
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning.	10	1.3%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	158	21.2%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach.	170	22.8%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	293	39.2%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	116	15.5%
Total	N=747	100%
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning.	7	0.9%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	169	22.6%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach.	148	19.8%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	284	38.0%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	139	18.6%
Total	N= 747	100%

**Discussion of Summary Statements and a-e Progress Data for FFY 2012:**

DES/AzEIP reviewed the child outcome data by program twice a year and EIPs were identified with missing data or data reflecting an impossible rating combination. EIPs were required to correct the data and technical assistance was provided.

Prior to March 2013, service coordinators submitted their entry and exit child outcome summary forms to the state office for manual input into the State's child outcome data system. In March, DES/AzEIP implemented 41 new early intervention program contracts statewide, and in April DES/AzEIP began the rollout of a new data system.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:**

Arizona met its targets for Outcome A-1, A-2, Outcome B-1 and B-2 and Outcome C-2. Arizona missed the target set for Outcome C-1 [Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program.] by 0.9 percent.

In the latter quarter of FFY 2012 DES/AzEIP implemented Team Based Early Intervention Services (TBEIS); this required the enactment of 44 new contracts statewide and the transfer of over 4000 children from existing programs to new programs. 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. DES/AzEIP revised its IFSP form to incorporate its Child and Family Assessment process and the Child Outcome Indicators. Additionally, DES/AzEIP produced webinars and posted those webinars to the DES/AzEIP website to address the IFSP development process and Transition which included the Child Outcomes Summary Form process.

The initial TA and Training focused on the new Service Coordinators and Team members involved in the transition to TBEIS and their respective roles and responsibilities related to compliance and improved outcomes. For FFY 2013, DES/AzEIP will review the Child Outcomes Summary Form process to emphasize the team decision-making process and how to record whether or not a child has made progress.

For Additional information on the IA implemented in FFY 2012, See Attachment A Arizona's APR/SPP Improvement Activities Table.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

Same description as included in Indicator #1.

**Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments**

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

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

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

**Measurement:**

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

**Target Data and Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:**

Target Data and Actual Data	FFY 2012 Target	FFY 2012	
		# Surveys/ Total Surveys	Actual
A. Know their rights.	93%	463/486	95.27%
B. Effectively communicate their children's needs.	93%	469/487	96.30%
C. Help their children develop and learn.	93%	474/489	96.93%

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 ("4") 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 annual IFSPs, when the survey is disseminated. However, DES/AzEIP analyzed the surveys by county, ethnicity, and age of the children 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.

DES/AzEIP received a total of 501 surveys for all questions; however, not all families rated all questions. This is a 16.639 % decrease from the 601 surveys received in FFY 2011.

**Representativeness:**

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>618 Data (2012)</b>	<b>AZ Survey Data</b>	<b>+/-</b>
American Indian	6%	8.18%	+2.18
Asian or Pacific Islander	2%	2.39%	+0.39
Black or African American	4%	5.18%	+1.18
Hispanic or Latino	38%	29.14%	-8.86
White	50%	47%	-3
<b>County</b>	<b>% Children served as of 10/1/12</b>	<b>% Surveys returned by county FFY 2012</b>	
Apache	0.90%	1.19%	+0.29
Cochise	1.19%	1.99%	+0.8
Coconino	2.32%	4.39%	+2.07
Gila	0.98%	0.79%	-0.19
Graham	0.89%	1.97%	+1.08
Greenlee	0.17%	0.19%	+0.02
La Paz	0.13%	0	-0.13
Maricopa	63.15%	49.30%	-13.85
Mohave	2.20%	7.98%	+5.78
Navajo	2.30%	2.99%	+0.69
Pima	13.46%	13.97%	+0.53
Pinal	7.19%	5.38%	-1.81
Santa Cruz	0.69%	0	-0.69
Yavapai	2.47%	4.39%	+1.92
Yuma	1.87%	1.79%	-0.08

In past years the State has seen over-representation of White families (+9 percent, FFY 2010) and under-representation of Hispanic/Latino families (-7 percent, FFY 2010). While the return rate for Hispanic/Latino families remained somewhat unchanged (-8 percent), the return rate for White families, decreased and is under-represented as compared to Census data for the State (-3 percent). A closer look at the data shows an increased percentage of families who self-identified as being American Indian, Asian or Pacific Islander or African American completed the family survey. In addition, the percent of

families who either declined to indicate a race or ethnicity (5.18 percent) or who indicated that their family was multi-racial (2.19 percent) increased. The changes in the way families are self-identifying their race and ethnicity appear to have contributed to the change in the return rate for those families who are identifying as white. This is representative in our states demographics.

DES/AzEIP compared the percentage of surveys returned by county for FFY 2011 with the percentage of children served by county as of October 1, 2011 using its 618 data. This year's data is similar to that submitted last year, in that ten out of fifteen counties received a higher percentage of surveys than the percentage of children served. Maricopa County, the State's largest county, was under-represented in its surveys by 13.85 percent.

The state continues to provide training to service coordinators on how and when to share the family survey with families to ensure all families have the opportunity to complete and submit the survey throughout their enrollment in early intervention.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:**

The State met its target: no explanation of progress/slippage or discussion about improvement strategies required.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

Same description as included in Indicator #1.

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find**

**Indicator 5:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

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

**Measurement:**

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012	≥ .63%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:**

.77%
------

Of the 86,400 infants and toddlers birth to 1 in Arizona, 667 or .77 percent had IFSPs during FFY 2012.

**The State of Arizona met its target in this area.**

The Arizona Early Intervention Program used the following data sources for completing this indicator:

- DES/AzEIP’s data system;
- Arizona’s October 1, 2012 Table 1, Report of Infants and Toddlers Receiving Early Intervention Services data reported to OSEP, submitted February 4, 2013;
- OSEP Table C1-9 FFY 2012 FINAL, Percent of infants and toddlers receiving early intervention services Under IDEA, Part C, by Age and State: 2012; and
- AZ Department of Administration 2012 Composite Population Estimates by age and county.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:**

The State met its target: no explanation of progress/slippage or discussion about improvement strategies required.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2013:**

The State met its target: no explanation of progress/slippage or discussion about improvement strategies required.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Same description as included in Indicator #1.

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find**

**Indicator 6:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

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

**Measurement:**

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012	≥1.86%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:**

1.98%
-------

Of the 257,642 infants and toddlers birth to 3 in Arizona, 5100 or 1.98 percent had IFSPs during FFY 2012.

**The State of Arizona met its target in this area**

The Arizona Early Intervention Program used the following data sources for completing this indicator:

- DES/AzEIP's data system;
- Arizona's October 1, 2012 Table 1, Report of Infants and Toddlers Receiving Early Intervention Services data reported to OSEP, submitted February 4, 2013;
- OSEP Table C1-9 FFY 2012 FINAL, Percent of infants and toddlers receiving early intervention services Under IDEA, Part C, by Age and State: 2012; and
- AZ Department of Administration 2012 Composite Population Estimates by age and county.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2012:**

The State met its target: no explanation of progress/slippage or discussion about improvement strategies required.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2013:**

The State met its target: no explanation of progress/slippage or discussion about improvement strategies required.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

Same description as included in Indicator #1.

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find**

**Indicator 7:** 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)

**Measurement:**

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012	100%

**Actual Target Data for 2012:**

**95% or 1177/1244 Eligible children**

*The measurements table for Indicator 7 states: If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.*

State data system data for the time period July 1 – September 30, 2012 were used to report statewide compliance levels for the 45 day timeline for this APR. This timeframe is representative of data for FFY 2012 because it includes all children referred, eligible, and with IFSPs developed statewide during that timeframe, from every early intervention program in the State. The numbers of children referred, evaluated and assessed, and with IFSPs developed between October 1 2012 and June 30, 2013 are consistent with those from the period July – September 2012 and earlier, showing a continued slight downward trend in the total number of eligible children, while timely evaluations/eligibility determination remain at or above 98% through June 30, 2013. IFSP timelines continued a downward trend throughout the year, but complete IFSP data is not available at the present time due to initial technical challenges with Arizona’s new I-TEAMS data system launched in April of 2012. Data collection and reporting for the period April 1 2013 – June 30, 2013 was severely disrupted, and records for that time period are still being updated in the data system at this time.

Statewide IFSP timeline compliance levels for all children were 95 percent or above for each calendar quarter from July 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012..

Compliance levels for October 1, 2012 – December 31, 2012: 98% (1113/1133) timely evaluation/eligibility determination; 92% timely IFSPs for eligible children (1045/1133). This is the last full quarter for which Arizona has complete 45 day timeline data.

Compliance levels for January 1, 2013 – January 31, 2013: 99% (363/368) timely evaluation/eligibility determination; 94% timely IFSPs for eligible children (345/368)

Compliance levels for February 1, 2013 – February 28, 2013: 99% (317/321) timely evaluation/eligibility determination; 97% timely IFSPs for eligible children (310/321).

IFSP data is not yet complete for March.

Compliance levels for April 1, 2013 – June 30, 2013: Approximately 98% timely evaluation/eligibility determination based on data available. IFSP data is not yet complete for this period.

Timelines are calculated based on the actual number of days from referral to initial IFSP for each eligible child. Calculations include children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as family circumstances, as documented in the child’s record.

**Infants Evaluated and Assessed and provided an Initial IFSP meeting Within Part C’s 45-day timeline:**

a. Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline.	1,177
b. Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted.	1,244
Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline (Percent = [(a) divided by (b)] times 100)	95%

**Accounting for untimely evaluations:**

- For the July-September 2012 report period, 99 percent (1,228/1,244) 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.
  - Nine percent (118/1244) of all eligible children had evaluation delays due to family circumstances. These children are included in the numerator and the denominator of AzEIP’s calculation.
- One hundred percent of children for whom an evaluation was required had an evaluation subsequently completed. AzEIP verified this through review of subsequent data for each child who did not have an evaluation timely completed.

- Reasons for eligibility/evaluation delay are documented in the child's record and reported in the data system. Periodic reviews of a selection of files validate the data and verify the documentation of the reason for delay.
- Sixteen eligible children had untimely evaluations/eligibility; that is, not completed within 45 days of referral. The sixteen does not include children for whom the reason for delay was family circumstances.
- The sixteen non-family reasons for evaluation delay break down as follows:
  - Fourteen due to team issues (e.g., evaluation not scheduled in a timely manner).
  - Two due to unreported reasons.

#### **Accounting for untimely IFSPs:**

- For the July-September 2012 report period, 95 percent (1,177/1,244) of eligible children for whom IFSPs were required, had timely IFSPs completed.
- 100 percent of children for whom an IFSP was required had an IFSP subsequently completed. AzEIP verified this through review of subsequent data for each child who did not have an evaluation timely completed.
- Reasons for eligibility/evaluation delay are documented in the child's record and reported in the data system. Periodic review of a selection of files validates the data and verifies the documentation of the reason for delay.
  - Sixty-seven (67) eligible children had untimely IFSPs; that is, not completed within 45 days of referral. The sixty-seven (67) does not include children for whom the reason for delay was family circumstances.
  - The sixty-seven (67) non-family reasons for IFSP delay break down as follows:
    - Fifty-seven (57) due to team issues (e.g., IFSP not scheduled in a timely manner).
    - Three (3) due to records issues (e.g., not receiving needed records in a timely manner).
    - Two (2) due to CAPTA issues (e.g. child in foster care)
    - Five due to unreported reason.
- Ten (10) findings of noncompliance were made during FFY 2012; correction of these findings will be reported on in the FFY 2013 APR.

#### **Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2012:**

Eligibility determination was completed at 99 percent compliance (1228/1244). However, the State experienced slippage in FFY 2012 from 97.3 percent to 95 percent compliance for timely IFSPs. A review of improvement activities was conducted, and the improvement activities were determined to be effective in supporting compliance.

#### Improvement activities that supported timelines during FFY 2012

The slippage in FFY 2012 was primarily related to the timelines for two of the largest early intervention contractors, covering seven early intervention programs (EIP). One of the two contractors had significant changes in management staff during this time period, resulting in inconsistent application of policy and procedure for a period of several months which contributed to their lower compliance. The other EIP had changes in service coordinators and challenges in maintaining adequate team capacity to ensure the timelines were met.

Nine (9) EIPs were at 99 percent compliance or higher. Seven (7) EIPs were between 90-95 percent compliance and the remaining two (2) EIPs were between 80-85 percent compliance.

Targeted and general technical assistance through on-site and phone meetings with TAMS and/or DES/AzEIP staff, written guidance/clarification and other strategies were provided.

- o Team-based model contractors were provided program-specific technical assistance related to the 45 day timeline requirements:
  - Forty-five day timeline progress reports were compiled and returned to each DES/AzEIP EIS program in the state at least monthly to ensure that local programs were closely tracking the 45 day timeline for all children and to enable the State to track statewide progress.

Utilize root cause analysis process to identify underlying reasons for non-compliance:

- o Corrective action plans for newly identified 45 day non-compliance included completion of a root cause analysis as a first step. The results of the root cause analysis were used to identify additional corrective action steps to address the correction of the noncompliance.

**Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):**

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2011 for this indicator: 97 percent.

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2011 (the period from July 1, 2011, through June 30, 2012).	13
2. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding).	12
3. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)].	1

**Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:**

4. Number of FFY 2011 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	1
5. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	1
6. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

**Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected: NA**

**Verification of Correction of FFY 2011 noncompliance (either timely or subsequent):**

Programs 1-13:

- 1: To ensure correction of child-specific noncompliance, the state ensured that the EIP program completed the evaluation and IFSP for each child, although late, by reviewing subsequent data system records for each child who did not receive a timely evaluation and IFSP.

2: To ensure the program was correctly implementing the timely evaluation and IFSP requirements (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) in 34 CFR §§ 303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a) AzEIP verified that the program timely corrected the 45 day timeline noncompliance through review of 100 percent of one month’s subsequent evaluation and IFSP data for that program through the State’s data system, and ensuring that each evaluation and IFSP were timely or were delayed due to documented family circumstances. Each of the twelve (12) programs achieved 100 percent compliance within one year after the finding was made. The one (1) remaining program achieved 100 percent compliance one year after the finding was made.

Statement from the Response Table	State’s Response
Because the State reported less than 100 percent compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance in the data the State reported for this indicator.	The State reported on the status of correction of noncompliance.
If the State does not report 100 percent compliance in the FFY 2012 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.	The State reviewed its improvement activities and determined the activities are effective and do not need to be revised.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2013 (if applicable):**

**N/A**

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

Same description as in Indicator 1.

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition**

**Indicator 8A:** The percentage of 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.

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

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning, including the reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2012	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:**

70%
-----

**Method used to collect data and the procedures used to collect these data:**

AzEIP’s integrated monitoring system is inclusive of a three year Self-Report process to gather data from each Early Intervention Program (EIP) on a three year cycle that is not available through the states data system. Selection of EIPs for Cycle 3 self-report was based on the amount of time since the EIP was last monitored, review of available data through the State’s database, such as the 45 day timeline, and review dispute resolution data. The level and extent of compliance and noncompliance was factored into the selection process.

.. Data reported for FFY 2012 was from the last year of the three year self-report cycle. Transition data were gathered manually using the Child File Review Sheet for Transition Planning from the only three

Early Intervention Programs (EIPs) left in the three year cycle. This resulted in an unexpectedly low number of children for whom transition planning was to occur during the Transition Planning data period from July 1, 2012 through September 30, 2012. The State reviewed and verified the data and issued Determination letters in the spring of 2013, which included findings of noncompliance.

**Children Exiting Part C who Received Timely Transition Planning:**

a. Number of toddlers exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday	26
b. Total number of toddlers exiting Part C services who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday	37
Percent of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.	<b>70%</b>

**Accounting for Untimely IFSP Transition Steps and Services:**


Seventy percent (26/37) of the files reviewed indicated the IFSP transition steps and services were documented on the IFSP and occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday

There were no documented delays due to family circumstances.

Thirty percent (11/37) of the files reviewed did not include documentation of the IFSP transition steps and services or did not occur at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday. These delays were due to the service coordinator not ensuring the requirements were implemented within the required timeline.

However, 81 percent (30/37) of the files reviewed indicated that the service coordinator did document the IFSP transition steps and services, although untimely.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2012:**

The State did not meet its target of 100 percent for FFY 2012 and experienced slippage of 19 percent from FFY 2011 data of 89 percent to FFY 2012 data of 70 percent. Analysis of data by the AzEIP Service providing agency and then by their local early intervention programs (EIP) identified:

- Of the files reviewed, 100 percent compliance was met with one EIP from the Arizona Schools for the Deaf and the Blind (ASDB) that included a review of four (4) Transition Planning Meetings with steps documented in the IFSP for a meeting which occurred within the required timeframe.
- Non-Compliance was identified with the remaining two (2) DDD EIPs that did not meet compliance at 100 percent for documentation of transitions steps and services or timeliness of the transition meeting. These EIPs were located in both urban and rural areas.
- The two EIPs, per their Determination letters, were required to implement corrective actions which required conducting a root cause analysis of their noncompliance using the Local Contributing Factor tool. Based on the identified issues (policies and procedures, data, supervision) the EIPs were required to develop meaningful improvement activities to correctly implement the requirements.
- The data was gathered during the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter in which the new requirements went into effect, which required the IFSP transition planning meeting to be held during the same time period as the transition conference, which may have contributed to the low compliance. Prior to the IDEA Part C regulation requiring the transition planning meeting to occur between the time the child's age is 2 years 6 months and 2 years 9 months, AzEIP had required the EIPs to conduct a transition planning meeting at the IFSP meeting closest to, but not before the child's second birthday. At the time the new regulations came into effect, the State had issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for contractors to participate in the recently adapted team-based model. Due to the RFP, the Lead Agency was not allowed to provide training directly to current contractors as this would create an unfair competitive advantage. Therefore webinars were developed and made available on the AzEIP website identifying this change in requirements. Each EIP was required to submit their staff participation in the webinars.
- Arizona also revised its IFSP to include the new regulatory requirements for documenting IFSP transition steps and services. A guidance document was issued late 2013.
- The AzEIP Transition Activities Table was revised, disseminated and posted on the website. This table is quick reference to the required activities and timelines.
- The State implemented a new web-based data system that includes required documentation of the IFSP Transition Planning Meeting within required timelines. The system currently has built in alerts that are sent to the service coordinator a month prior to the required timeline. This was not available at the time of these transitions. The state office as well as the EIPs will be able to run reports to track the timelines and to provide oversight to ensure appropriate strategies are developed and implemented, which will improve the state's ability to meet the target for this indicator.

For Additional information on the IA implemented in FFY 2012, See Attachment A Arizona's APR/SPP Improvement Activities Table

**Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100 percent compliance):**

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2011 for this indicator: 89 percent

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2011 (the period from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012)	9
2. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	9

3. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0
---	---

**Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance Corrected Beyond One Year (if State reported less than 100 percent compliance):**

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2011 for this indicator:

4. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2011 (the period from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012) not Corrected within One Year	0
5. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State verified as corrected ( <u>beyond</u> one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	0
6. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected <u>beyond</u> one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

**Demonstrating Correction as outlined in 09-02 Memo**

**1. Accounting for All Instances of Noncompliance in FFY 2011:**

- The State accounted for all instances of noncompliance as identified through the three year self-report cycle.

**2. Noncompliance from FFY 2011 Occurred in 3 EIPs as Follows:**

- DDD, which included five of their EIPs was at 87 percent (143/164). One of the EIPs was at 99 percent, demonstrating substantial compliance but none of the EIPs met compliance at 100 percent. The remaining four DDD EIPs compliance ranged from 83 percent (44/53) to 40 percent (4/10).
- The DES/AzEIP TBEIS programs were at 93 percent (52/56). Three of the EIPs were at 89 (8/9) percent, 88 (7/8) percent and 80 (8/10) percent compliance, respectively.
- A root cause analysis of the EIP's data conducted by the State and local team during site reviews determined that the contributing factor to the noncompliance was due to service coordinators not following AzEIP policies and procedures for appropriately documenting completion of the transition steps and services on the IFSP.

**3. To Address the Noncompliance, the State Required the EIP to:**

- Develop meaningful strategies to correct the noncompliance using the Local Contributing Factor Tool
- Ensure their service coordinators listened to the Child Find and Transition In by 3 PowerPoint and reviewed the AZEIP Transition Activities Table, both of which were available on the AZEIP website.
- Review subsequent child records to verify if the identified strategies to correct the noncompliance were effective, meaning the EIP was making progress or met compliance in

documenting the transition steps and services on the child's IFSP. If the EIP was not making progress, the EIP was required to review and revise the strategies, if necessary.

**4. Specific actions that were taken to verify the correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance (either timely or subsequent):**

- Prong 1: To ensure correction of child-specific noncompliance, the State verified that the EIPs have developed an IFSP with transition steps and services for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS 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.
- Prong 2: To ensure the EIP was (1) correctly implementing 34 CFR §§ 303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) and 20 U.S.C. 1436(a)(3) and (d)(8) (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) the State required the EIP to either a) submit updated data for the state to review and verify or b) the State conducted on-site reviews to verify that the EIP was correctly implementing the requirements. In either instance, the state verified the program was implementing the requirements at 100 percent AzEIP implemented Team-based Early Intervention Contracts beginning March 1, 2013, which included the transition of nearly 4,000 children into new EIPs. One EIP who had not yet corrected non-compliance as of that date is no longer in existence. All individual records for children who were with that EIP have been corrected, but the EIP is no longer in existence to verify correction of non-compliance at the program level.

Required Response	State Response
<p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS 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. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>	<p>The State included a description of correction consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, including the specific actions the State took to verify the correction.</p>

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2013 (if applicable):**

The State implemented a new web-based data system that includes required documentation of the IFSP Transition Planning Meeting within required timelines. The system has built in alerts that are sent to the service coordinator a month prior to the required timeline. The state office as well as the EIPs will be able to run reports to track the timelines and to provide oversight to ensure appropriate strategies are developed and implemented, which will improve the state's ability to meet the target for this indicator. In addition, the State revised the IFSP to reflect the required components of the transition steps and services and developed a corresponding IFSP Guidance document. This document includes a description of the required documentation of the transition steps and services.

The State is not proposing any revisions to the current improvement activities.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Same description as included in Indicator #1.

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition**

**Indicator 8B:** The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has 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 potentially eligible Part B preschool services. (Transition Notification)

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

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and the LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning, including the reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:**

30%
-----

**Method used to collect data and the procedures used to collect these data:**

AzEIP’s integrated monitoring system is inclusive of a three year Self-Report process to gather data from each Early Intervention Program (EIP) on a three year cycle that is not available through the states data system. Selection of EIPs for Cycle 3 self-report was based on the amount of time since the EIP was last monitored, review of available data through the State’s database, such as the 45 day timeline, and review dispute resolution data. The level and extent of compliance and noncompliance was factored into the selection process.

Data reported for FFY 2012 was from the last year of the three year self-report cycle. Transition data were gathered manually using the Child File Review Sheet for Transition Planning from the only three Early Intervention Programs (EIPs) left in the three year cycle. This resulted in an unexpectedly low number of children for whom transition planning was to occur during the Transition Planning data period from July 1,

2012 through September 30, 2012. The State reviewed and verified the data and issued Determination letters in the spring of 2013, which included findings of noncompliance.

**Arizona’s Definition of Potentially Eligible for Part B:** 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.

**Children Exiting Part C who Received Timely Transition Planning (Notification to LEA)**

**Opt-Out Policy** – the State has an approved Opt-Out Policy on file and captures this data through the integrated monitoring activities, including the State’s data system.

a. Number of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the notification to the LEA and SEA occurred at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for potentially eligible Part B preschool services.	6
b. Total number of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B where the notification to the LEA and SEA occurred at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for potentially eligible Part B preschool services.	20
Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday (Notification to LEA) (Percent = [(a) divided by (b)] times 100)	30%

Two parents opted-out of the Notification to the LEA and SEA, which was verified by review of the appropriate documentation in the child’s file. These instances were not included in the state’s calculation of timely notification.

**Accounting for untimely Notifications to the LEA**

Activity	Number	Number that were timely	Number not timely
Documentation of PEA sent to LEA at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for potentially eligible Part B preschool services	20	16	4
Documentation of PEA sent to LEA <b>and</b> SEA at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for potentially eligible Part B preschool services * Note the numbers included in this row are include also in the numbers for the above, and are not in addition to the numbers for the above	10	6	4

Thirty percent (6/20) of the children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B had timely Notification to both the LEA **and** the SEA. However, even though performance was low for this requirement, it was noted that Eighty percent (16/20) of the notifications to the LEA were within the required timeline..

Sixty percent (6/10) of the notifications sent to the LEA **and** the SEA met the required timeline. All Notifications that were not timely were late due to the service coordinator not sending them to the PEA and the SEA on or before the child’s age of 2 years and 9 months. Late notification ranged from 2 years 9

months and 1 day to 3 years of age. In the instances where children were still in the jurisdiction of the EIP, the State verified that although late, the notifications were sent to the LEA.

Of the files reviewed, 100 percent compliance was met with one EIP from the Arizona Schools for the Deaf and the Blind that included a review of four (4) PEA notification forms sent to the LEA **and** SEA within required timelines.

Noncompliance was identified with the remaining two (2) DDD EIPs that did not meet compliance at 100 percent for documentation of transitions steps or timeliness of the transition meeting. These EIPs were located in both urban and rural areas.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2012:**

The State did not meet its target of 100 percent for FFY 2012 and experienced slippage from FFY 2011 data at 76 percent to FFY 2012 data at 3 percent. Analysis of data by the AzEIP Service providing agency and then by their local early intervention programs (EIP) identified:

- Data for this Indicator was gathered from July 1, 2012 through September 30, 2012, which was the first quarter the requirement to send the PEA Notification form to both the LEA and SEA was in place. The data clearly indicates that the service coordinators did not understand that they were required to send the PEA Notification form to the SEA, in addition to the LEA.
- There were PEA Notifications sent when the child was 2 years 9 months and 1 day. Based on discussions with the supervisor and service coordinators, they did not understand that the requirements were on or before the child is 2 years and 9 months.
- Many of the service coordinators did not have internal processes for tracking required timelines which contributed their noncompliance.
- At the time the new regulations came into effect, the State had issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for contractors to participate in the recently adapted team-based model. Due to the RFP, the Lead Agency was not allowed to provide training to current contractors as this would create an unfair competitive advantage. Therefore webinars were developed and made available on the AzEIP website identifying this change in requirements.

The two DDD EIPs were required to develop internal tracking procedures to ensure transition conferences were scheduled for each child within the required timelines. Supervisors were required to develop procedures for reviewing files to ensure service coordinators were sending PEA Notifications to the SEA and the PEA within the required timelines.

The AzEIP Transition Activities Table was revised to reflect the new requirements, disseminated and posted on the website. This table is quick reference to the required activities and timelines.

The State implemented a new web-based data system that includes required documentation that the PEA Notification was sent to PEA the within required timelines, unless the parent opts-out of the notification process. If the parent opts out, the date must be entered into the data system. The system has built in alerts that are sent to the service coordinator a month prior to the required timeline, The state office as well as the EIPs will be able to run reports to track the timelines and to provide oversight to ensure appropriate strategies are developed and implemented.

For Additional information on the IA implemented in FFY 2012, See Attachment A, Arizona's APR/SPP Improvement Activities Table.

**Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100 percent compliance):**

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2011 for this indicator: 76 percent

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2011 (the period from July 1, 2011, through June 30, 2012)	10
2. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	10
3. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	<b>0</b>

**Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance BEYOND One Year (if State reported less than 100 percent compliance):**

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2011 for this indicator: 87 percent

Number of FFY 2011 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
Number of FFY 2011 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	0
Number of FFY 2011 findings not verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	<b>0</b>

**Verification of Correction of FFY 2011 noncompliance (either timely or subsequent):**

**Demonstrating Correction as outlined in 09-02 Memo**

**1. Accounting for All Instances of Noncompliance:**

- The State accounted for all instances of noncompliance as identified through the three year Self-Report Cycle.

**2. Noncompliance Occurred in Five EIPs as Follows:**

- DDD, including five EIPs was at 75 percent (113/151 files). Of the five EIPs, breakdown of data reveals:

DES/DDD		
Files Compliant	Files Reviewed	Total Percentage
36	53	68%
54	64	84%
5	10	50%
11	14	79%
7	10	70%

113	151	75%
-----	-----	-----

- DES/AzEIP, including eight EIPs was at 78 percent (43/55). Five EIPs had findings of noncompliance, the breakdown is as follows:

DES/AzEIP		
Files Compliant	Files Reviewed	Total Percentage
3	5	60%
6	8	75%
7	9	78%
9	10	90%
0	5	0%
<b>43</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>78%</b>

3. To Address

the

**Noncompliance, the State Required the EIP to:**

- Submit subsequent data to verify child specific noncompliance, for children still in the jurisdiction of the early intervention program.
- EIPs with verified self-report data less than 85 percent were required to conduct a root cause analysis, using the Local Contributing Factor Tool to identify the causes of the non-compliance, and to use the information to develop meaningful strategies to correct the noncompliance, For programs with data less than 76 percent, the State review team facilitated the root cause analysis process with EIPs selected for site-reviews and required the EIPs to use the information to develop meaningful strategies to correct the noncompliance.
- Submit subsequent documentation of child’s records to ensure the service coordinators were correctly implementing the requirements.

**4. Verification of Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance (either timely or subsequent):**

- Prong 1: To verify correction of child-specific noncompliance, the State required the EIP to send the LEA Notification to the school district, although late, as long as the child was still in the jurisdiction of the EIP. AzEIP TAMS verified correction through review of documentation.
- Prong 2: To verify the program was correctly implementing the LEA notification requirement (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1), the State required the EIP to either a) submit updated data, of children nearing the age of three and potentially eligible for Part B, to the State to review and verify or b) the State conducted on-site reviews to review additional child records to verify that the EIP was correctly implementing the requirements. In either instance, the State verified the program was implementing the requirements at 100 percent. AzEIP implemented Team-based Early Intervention Contracts beginning March 1, 2013, which included the

transition of nearly 4,000 children into new EIPs. Five EIPs (two which are in the same organization) who had not yet corrected noncompliance as of that date are no longer in existence. All individual records for children who were with that EIP have been corrected, but the EIP is no longer in existence to verify correction of noncompliance at the program level.

**Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):**

Statement from the Response Table	State’s Response
<p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator; (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has provided notification to the LEA for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS 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. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>	<p>The State reported that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR § 303.148(b)(1) (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has provided notification to the LEA for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS 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. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State described the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2013 (if applicable):**

Given the recent implementation of the State’s data system and existing improvement activities, which include targeted training and technical assistance related to transition planning and timelines, the State will not be revising its improvement activities for FFY 2013.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

Same description as included in Indicator #1.

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition**

**Indicator 8C:** The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning 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.

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

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning, including the reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2012	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2012**

64%
-----

**Method used to collect data and the procedures used to collect these data:**

AzEIP's integrated monitoring system is inclusive of a three year Self-Report process to gather data from each Early Intervention Program (EIP) on a three year cycle that is not available through the states data system. Selection of EIPs for Cycle 3 self-report was based on the amount of time since the EIP was last monitored, review of available data through the State's database, such as the 45 day timeline, and review dispute resolution data. The level and extent of compliance and noncompliance was factored into the selection process.

.. Data reported for FFY 2012 was from the last year of the three year self-report cycle. Transition data were gathered manually using the Child File Review Sheet for Transition Planning from the only three Early Intervention Programs (EIPs) left in the three year cycle. This resulted in an unexpectedly low number of children for whom transition planning was to occur during the Transition Planning data period

from July 1, 2012 through September 30, 2012. The State reviewed and verified the data and issued Determination letters in the spring of 2013, which included findings of noncompliance.

**Children Exiting Part C who Received Timely Transition Planning (Transition Conference):**

a. Number of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred 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.	21
b. Total number of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B 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.	33
c.  The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning 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	<b>64%</b>

Two parents declined to have transition conference. These two instances were verified by the State and were not included in the calculation for timely transition conferences.

**Accounting for untimely transition conferences:**

	Yes	No
Conference held	31	2
Conference held in timely manner	18	15
Reason for not being held in timely manner		System = 12   Family = 3

Accounting for untimely services:

- For the three Early Intervention Programs who completed a Self-Report during FFY 2012, 58 percent (18/31) of the infants and toddlers received their transition conferences in a timely manner.
  - Sixteen percent (3/18) of the infants and toddlers had delays due to exceptional family circumstances. These infants and toddlers are included in the numerator and the denominator.
  - AzEIP verified documentation of the exceptional family circumstances through a review of child files.
- Twelve infants and toddlers did not receive timely transition conference due to system delays.
  - All 12 of the system reasons were in the two DDD EIPs. A review of the service coordination notes indicated the service coordinators, in the majority of instance, did not begin to plan and schedule the transition conferences early enough.
  - Service coordinators reported that they did not have internal processes for tracking children nearing the age of transition to ensure they had time to schedule the conference to occur within the timeframe required. The web based alert system was not available at this time.

- All of the infants and toddlers, who were still in the jurisdiction of the EIPs, received transition conferences, although late. AzEIP verified this through review of submitted documentation of the actual start date for each service.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2012:**

The State did not meet its target of 100 percent for FFY 2012 and experienced slippage from FFY 2011 data of 77 percent to FFY 2012 data at 63 percent. Analysis of data by the AzEIP Service providing agency and then by their local early intervention programs (EIP) identified:

- Of the files reviewed, 100 percent compliance was met with one EIP from the Arizona Schools for the Deaf and the Blind that included a review of four (4) Transition Conferences which occurred within the required timeframe.
- Noncompliance was identified with the remaining two (2) DDD EIPs that did not meet compliance at 100 percent for documentation of transitions steps or timeliness of the transition conference. These EIPs were located in both urban and rural areas
- At the time the new regulations came into effect, the State had issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for contractors to participate in the recently adapted team-based model. Due to the RFP, the Lead Agency was not allowed to provide training to current contractors as this would create an unfair competitive advantage. Therefore webinars were developed and made available on the AzEIP website identifying this change in requirements.
- The AzEIP Transition Activities Table was revised, disseminated and posted on the website. This table is quick reference to the required activities and timelines.

The two DDD EIPs were required to develop internal tracking procedures to ensure transition conferences were scheduled for each child within the required timelines. Supervisors were required to develop procedures for reviewing files to ensure service coordinators were scheduling and facilitating the transition conferences within the required timelines.

The AzEIP Technical Assistance Monitoring Specialist (TAMS) and the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) representative provided targeted technical assistance to schools districts and EIPs who were experiencing challenges in meeting required timelines. The purpose of the meetings were assist the local Part C and Part B programs in building relationships and developing working procedures to ensure both programs had a shared understanding of the roles, responsibilities and timelines for transition conferences for children nearing the age of three and potentially eligible for Part B.

The AzEIP TAMS provided targeted technical assistance to the EIPS through the development of corrective actions, regular status check to monitor the EIPs progress on their corrective action plan. The TAMS provided support to EIP supervisors with developing training strategies and tools for supervisors to use to build program capacity for providing ongoing and/or as needed training to staff.

The state implemented its' new web-based data system which will send alerts to the service coordinator when the child is nearing transition to ensure the transition conference is held within the required timelines. This feature will assist the service coordinator in tracking each child's timelines, one of the contributing factors to the identified noncompliance. Supervisors and administrators will be able to run the reports as a preventative activity in ensuring the transition conferences are held timely, another activity that is currently not occurring on a regular, consistent basis.

For Additional information on the IA implemented in FFY 2012, See Attachment A Arizona's APR/SPP Improvement Activities Table.

**Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100 percent compliance):**

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2011 for this indicator: 77 percent.

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2011 (the period from July 1, 2011, through June 30, 2012)	11
2. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one (1) year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	11
3. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus two (2)]	<b>0</b>

**Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance BEYOND One Year (if State reported less than 100 percent compliance):**

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2011 for this indicator: 82 percent

Number of FFY 2011 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
Number of FFY 2011 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	0
Number of FFY 2011 findings not verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	<b>0</b>

**Verification of Correction of FFY 2011 noncompliance (either timely or subsequent):**

**Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011:**

**Demonstrating Correction as outlined in 09-02 Memo**

**1. Accounting for All Instances of Noncompliance:**

Program	Files Complaint	Files Reviewed	Total Percentage
1	3	4	75%
2	7	8	88%
3	2	5	40%
4	7	8	88%
5	7	9	78%
6	9	10	90%
7	34	53	64%
8	54	65	83%
9	8	10	80%
10	8	11	73%
11	7	9	78%

- Through data verification and subsequent root cause analysis process, including interview with supervisors and their service coordinators and families, the State was able to identify the following contributing factors to the noncompliance:

**Policies and Procedures**

- Service coordinators consistently reported understanding transition timelines.
- However service coordinators struggle with not understanding their role and responsibility to schedule and facilitate transition conferences within the required timelines, regardless of the school districts limited availability to participate.

**Data**

- Programs are not using data to institute and develop procedures to ensure timelines are met.
  - Programs are not utilizing resources available in the database to run reports to identify children who are approaching transition
  - Programs are not tracking children to ensure transition activities are completed on time.

**Supervision**

- Supervisors are not consistently completing internal reviews to monitor their program data (re: transition) and their staff compliance with transition policy and timelines.
- Supervisors are not assessing data to identify the root cause and implement procedures to correct noncompliance and ensure ongoing monitoring of data.
- Service coordinators reported not knowing the purpose and process for utilizing the AzEIP/ADE Alert System when having difficulty arranging timely transition conferences with the school districts

**2. To Address the Noncompliance, the State Required the EIP to:**

- EIPs were required to develop internal tracking procedures to ensure transition conferences were scheduled for each child within the required timelines, unless the parent declined a conference.
- Supervisors were required to develop procedures for reviewing files to ensure service coordinators were scheduling and facilitating the transition conferences within the required timelines, when the parent agreed to have a conference.
- Develop a corrective action plan with meaningful strategies to address the contributing factors related to the noncompliance. Submit subsequent documentation of child's records to ensure the service coordinators were correctly implementing the requirements.

**3. Verification of Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance (either timely or subsequent):**

- Prong 1: To verify correction of child-specific noncompliance, the State required the EIP to send the PEA Notification/Referral to the school district, although late, as long as the child was still in the jurisdiction of the EIP. AzEIP Technical Assistance and Monitoring Specialists verified correction through review of documentation.
- Prong 2: To verify the program was correctly implementing the transition conference requirements (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) in 34C.F.R. § 303.148(b)(2)(i) a subsequent on-site review of files, for children nearing the age of three was conducted by the AzEIP TAMS to ensure the files included documentation of timely transition conferences. AzEIP implemented Team-based Early Intervention Contracts beginning March 1, 2013, which included the transition of nearly 4,000 children into new EIPs. Four EIPs who had not yet corrected noncompliance as of that date is no longer in existence. All individual records for children who were with that EIP have been corrected, but the EIP is no longer in existence to verify correction of noncompliance at the program level.

**Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):**

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
<p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has conducted a transition conference, although late, for any child potentially eligible for Part B whose transition conference was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the</p>	<p>The State reported on the status of correction of noncompliance in the data the State reported for this indicator. The State reported that it has verified that each EIP program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the regulatory requirement (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has conducted a transition conference, although late, for any child potentially eligible for Part B whose transition conference was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State described the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>

correction.	
-------------	--

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2013 (if applicable):**

Given the recent implementation of the State's data system and existing improvement activities, which include targeted training and technical assistance related to transition planning and timelines, the State will not be revising its improvement activities for FFY 2013.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

Same as Indicator # 1.

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision**

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

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

**Measurement:**

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

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

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

States are required to use the “Indicator C9 Worksheet” to report data for this indicator (see Attachment 1).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2012</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Actual Target Data for 2012:**

97.6 % (164/168)
------------------

**Describe the process for selecting EIS programs for Monitoring:**

In FFY 2011, all thirty-three EIPs in the State were monitored for timely and accurate data related to ethnicity and race, exit dates and reason data, and whether data was uploaded timely. Thirteen of the thirty-three EIPs were also monitored for initial IFSP meetings within the 45 day timeline and fifteen out of the thirty-three EIPs were selected to submit a self-report, which includes timely provision of services, services in the natural environment, and related requirements for child and family outcomes.

Selection of EIPs for Cycle 2 self-report was based on multiple factors, including whether the EIP submitted a self-report in the first year of the 3 year self-report cycle, review of available data through the State’s database, such as the 45 day timeline, and a review of the EIP’s dispute resolution data. The level and extent of compliance and noncompliance was factored into the selection process.

Twelve of the thirty-three EIPs were selected for a site review for the purposes of identifying the contributing factors to their compliance, noncompliance and program performance. The Local Contributing Factor tool developed by the OSEP TA centers was used during the review. The site review included representatives from the State office and the local EIPs, along with the AzEIP Technical Assistance and Monitoring Specialists. Data was gathered through observations, interviews with supervisors, service coordinators, other team members and families enrolled in the EIP. The review and analysis of the data provided the EIP with a summary of the factors identified as contributing to their noncompliance. Based on this information, the EIPs were required to develop a Corrective Action Plan with meaningful strategies to implement program practices resulting in improved outcomes for children and families.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2012:**

The State experienced progress from 79 percent compliance in FFY 2011 to 99.4 percent compliance in FFY 2012. There was only one program that the State was not able to verify correction within one year of the notification of noncompliance. However, the State subsequently verified the correction within 2 months.

The State attributes the progress in the timely verification of correction of compliance to several key factors, including the requirement that EIPs use the Local Contributing Factor Tool to determine the root causes of their noncompliance, the development of meaningful improvement strategies to address the identified root causes, the focus on providing technical assistance to the supervisors in developing and implementing appropriate training and follow up to ensure the staff understood and implemented the regulatory requirements, and an increase in status checks with the EIPs and the State office. These more frequent status checks, which included a review of the improvement strategies and the EIPs data, afforded the EIPs the opportunity to revise and adjust their strategies, when necessary. This process increased the EIPs capacity to use their data in a meaningful way that increased their understanding and implementation of the requirements, which resulted in achieving 100 percent compliance.

**Timely Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):**

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2011 (the period from July 1, 2011, through June 30, 2012) (Sum of Column a on the Indicator C 9 Worksheet)	<b>168</b>
2. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS programs of the finding) (Sum of Column b on the Indicator C 9 Worksheet)	<b>164</b>
3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	<b>4</b>

**Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:**

4. Number of FFY 2011 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	<b>4</b>
5. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	<b>4</b>
6. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	<b>0</b>

**Verification of Correction of findings during the FFY 2012 year (either timely or subsequent)**

For the 164 findings that were verified as corrected in a timely manner, the State verified correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

1. **Accounting for All Instances of Noncompliance:** The State accounted for all instances of noncompliance as identified through its integrated monitoring activities; including self-report data from Cycle 2 of the three year self-report cycle and data from the State’s database.
2. **Noncompliance Occurred in EIPs as Follows:**

Indicator 1	Timely Provision of Services	8 EIPs
Indicator 2	Services in NE – Related Requirement	5 EIPs
Indicator 7	Initial IFSP within 45 days	13 EIPs
Indicator 8a	IFSP with transition steps and services	9 EIPs
Indicator 8b	LEA Notifications FFY 2009	10 EIPs
Indicator 8c	Transition Conferences	11 EIPs
Indicator 3	Child Outcomes Related Requirements	14 EIPs
Indicator 4	Family Outcomes Related Requirements	14 EIPs
Indicator 14	Timely and Accurate Data	24 EIPs

**3. To Address the Noncompliance:**

- DES/AzEIP issued a Determination Letter to each EIP that included the required actions to correct the identified noncompliance. (All findings were verified as corrected within the required time lines and according to the required 2 prongs of correction as described below in #4).
  - All EIPs were required to submit subsequent data to demonstrate correction of child-specific noncompliance. The additional required actions were based on the review and analysis of data and the extent and nature of the EIP's noncompliance.
  - Programs with isolated noncompliance were generally required to a) review and revise local procedures, as needed, b) access T/A or training through the AzEIP Technical Assistance and Monitoring Specialists (TAMS), and c) submit new records to verify correction and implementation of the regulatory requirement.
  - EIPs with systemic noncompliance were required to a) work with the State monitoring team to identify the contributing factor/root cause of the noncompliance, which often occurred as part of a site review, b) develop a Corrective Action Plan with changes to local procedures, supervision, personnel, data collection and/or provision of training /TA, and c) submit one month of new data (more if necessary for smaller programs) to verify correction and implementation of the regulatory requirements.
- Based on the frequency outlined in the EIPs CAP, the AzEIP TAMS met with the EIPs to a) provide identified training and/or TA, b) review the effectiveness of the strategies implemented under their CAP, c) review files to determine if strategies resulted in the EIP making progress or meeting compliance, d) revise strategies, if necessary and e) review new data to verify correction and implementation of the requirements.

**4. Verification of Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance (either timely or subsequent):**

- Prong 1: To verify correction of child-specific noncompliance, the State required the EIP to correct each instance of the noncompliance. If the EIP was selected for a site review, the State team verified documentation of the correction for the related requirements under Indicator 3 and 4 and for Indicators 1, 8a, 8b, and 8c, through review of the child's record. EIPs not selected for site review submitted documentation of the correction to the DES/AzEIP office for verification. To ensure correction of child-specific noncompliance for Indicator 7, the State ensured that the EIP program completed the evaluation and IFSP for each child, although late, by reviewing subsequent data system records for each child who did not receive a timely evaluation and IFSP. To ensure correction of child-specific noncompliance related to missing data elements, the State ensured each EIP program completed the missing data elements for each child by reviewing subsequent data system records for each child who had missing data elements.
- Prong 2: To verify the program was correctly implementing each of the regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) the AzEIP TAMS conducted a review of new child files to ensure each requirement in Indicator 1, 8A, 8B, and 8C, and related requirements for Indicator 3 and 4 was at 100 percent compliance. AzEIP verified that the program timely corrected the 45 day timeline noncompliance through review of 100 percent of one month's subsequent evaluation and IFSP data for that program through the State's data system, and ensuring that each evaluation and IFSP were timely or were delayed due to documented family circumstances. DES/AzEIP reviewed 100 percent of one month's of subsequent new child records in the State's database to verify

compliance with required data elements. Each EIP achieved 100 percent compliance. AzEIP implemented Team-based Early Intervention Contracts beginning March 1, 2013, which included the transition of nearly 4,000 children into new EIPs. Five EIPs (3 who were within the same organization) who had not yet corrected noncompliance as of that date are no longer in existence. All individual records for children who were with those EIPs have been corrected, but the EIPs are no longer in existence to verify correction of noncompliance at the program level.

**Additional Information required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):**

<b>Statement from the Response Table</b>	<b>State’s Response</b>
<p>When reporting in the FFY 2012 APR on correction of findings of noncompliance, the State must report that it verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2011: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2012 APR, the State must use the Indicator 9 Worksheet.</p>	<p>The State reported that it verified that each EIP program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2011: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>The State described the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>The State used and attached the Indicator C-9 Worksheet.</p>
<p>In responding to Indicators 1, 7, 8A, 8B, and 8C in the FFY 2012 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p>	<p>The State reported on correction of the noncompliance for Indicator 1, 7, 8A, 8B, and 8C under the indicators.</p>

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2013**

**NA**

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

Same description in Indicator 1.

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision**

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:**

N/A **Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:**

N/A

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2013:**

N/A

**The Arizona Early Intervention Program  
State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) Improvement Activities**

For the APR due February 1, 2014, the Reporting Period is: July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013

FFY12 SPP/APR Improvement Activities		APR Date	Indicator(s)	Status	Proposed Revision to Improvement Activities/Justification
1.	Evaluate General Supervision policies, procedures, forms and tools, and revise improve efficiency and effectiveness.	June 2012, 2013	1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14	At the conclusion of the monitoring season, AzeIP staff and the AzeIP M-TEAMS (which includes the AzeIP Technical Assistance and Monitoring Specialists, Division of Developmental Disabilities Liaisons and the Arizona State Schools for the Deaf and the Blind representatives) reviewed the implementation of the monitoring procedures, forms and tools used for the year.	
2.	DDD will, with modification appropriate to DDD, implement AzeIP policies and procedures for early intervention services for children, birth to three, and their families. Policies, procedures, directives, and other guidelines will comply with IDEA Part C and AzeIP.	July 2010 and ongoing	9	DDD adopted AzeIP policies and procedures, and notified DDD staff via a Policy Alert, email, and posted the link to AzeIP policies and procedures in the DDD online policy manual.	
3.	Develop a web-based data system to manage child and family, professional, contractual and general supervision data.	December 2013	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 14	DES/AzeIP's new data system, I-TEAMS, was implemented March 2013 with the start of AzeIP's new, statewide team-based early intervention contracts. I-TEAMS includes contract information, professional provider registration, child data, and billing and invoicing. This data system will be the "system of record" for all children referred and eligible for the Arizona Early Intervention Program. Service Coordinators and providers will receive alerts related to activities with required timeframes. The web-based system will provide DES the opportunity to use data for periodic review, general supervision	

Improvement Activity	APR Timeline	Indicator(s)	Status	Proposed Changes
4. Implement data editing and validation processes in order to identify unusual findings in a timely manner, including regular review/monitoring of programs/public agencies' practices in collecting, editing and reporting data.	July 2010 – June 2012	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 14	activities and fiscal monitoring. DES' Division of Technology Services (DTS) continued to provide valuable support and assistance to DES/AzeIP, including improvements to analysis tools that provide increased efficiency, flexibility, and detailed analysis capabilities.	
5. Utilize root cause analysis process to identify challenges and barriers to correction of non-compliance and low performance.	July 2010 and ongoing per GS policies	1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14	Using the Local Contributing Factor Tool developed by NECTAC, DAC and WRRC, AzeIP collaborated with the EIPs demonstrating noncompliance to assist in identifying root causes of the noncompliance. Utilizing the data gathered from review of records, program internal policies and procedures and interviews with families, providers and administrators, the root causes of noncompliance were categorized and based on the unique challenges/ barriers experienced by each EIP, strategies and action steps were developed to ensure correction.	
6. Revise and implement the AzeIP Family Survey.	June 2013	1, 4	Due to the significant efforts and resources needed for the statewide implementation of the 41 new AzeIP team-based Early Intervention contracts and the corresponding transition of families into the new programs, the revised family survey was not implemented as planned.	
7. Use survey data to identify strengths, limitations and opportunities for improvement.	July 2013	1, 4	No update.	
8. Pursue contract sanctions to address persistently low performance and/or noncompliance not corrected within one year.	July 2010 and ongoing per GS policies	1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 11	Contract sanctions, such as increased reporting and bi-weekly status check calls with DES/AzeIP, were implemented with EIPs who did not correct noncompliance within one year.	

Improvement Activity		APR Timeline	Indicator(s)	Status	Proposed Changes
<b>A. Establish an adequate number of qualified personnel</b>					
1.	Identify the reasons that early intervention professionals, by discipline and geographic area, decide to remain in or leave the field of early intervention.	August 2014	1	Due to the issuance of a competitive Request For Proposal for new contracts, and the subsequent implementation of the new contracts, DES/AzEIP was not able to issue the survey to professionals for this activity. Once the new contracts are in place, the survey will be utilized.	
2.	Enhance and coordinate recruitment and retention with potential partners, such as universities, ADE, First Things First, Therapy Boards and Associations, etc.	Ongoing	1, 2, 8, 10, 11	DES/AzEIP staff continues to coordinate with First Things First on their loan incentive program for early intervention therapists. DES undertakes recruitment activities to increase needed personnel.	
<b>B. Promote evidence-based early intervention practices, regardless of service delivery model and/or contract structure</b>					
1	Expand implementation of the team-based model and participation-based practices.	Ongoing	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11	The Department of Economic Security (DES) awarded regional team-based early intervention services contracts throughout the State in November 2012 and implemented the contracts 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. The contracts are administered by the Department's Arizona Early Intervention Program (DES/AzEIP) and serve all families and their children, birth to three years of age,	

Improvement Activity	APR Timeline	Indicator(s)	Status	Proposed Changes	
			<p>who are eligible for the Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD), Arizona State Schools for the Deaf and the Blind (ASDB), and AzEIP (a.k.a. AzEIP-only). This direction aligns contracts with evidence-based practice, establishes a uniform contract and rate structure for the Department's most frequently utilized early intervention services, and responds to challenges with ensuring timely services in all areas of the State.</p> <p>NECTAC and MPRRC, in collaboration with, AzEIP, finalized the AzEIP Fidelity Checklist. The AzEIP Fidelity Checklist is a self-assessment tool to support early intervention programs in looking at compliance requirements and the fidelity of their implementation on the Mission and Key Principles of Early Intervention and the Team Based Early Intervention Services Model practices. The Checklist was designed so that Early Intervention Program Teams within a region and/or individual team members could perform self-assessments on a specific focus area (e.g. Family/Caregiver Engagement), for a specific practice (e.g. Initial Contact/Discussion of Early Intervention), or of all focus areas and practices.</p> <p>Individualized program support was provided by assigning each contractor an AzEIP TAMS, DDD Liaison, and ASDB representative for technical assistance in implementing team based services.</p>		
2	Strengthen Child and Family Assessment practices to ensure that assessment yields meaningful information about family priorities,	December 2012	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11	DES/AzEIP implemented a new child and family assessment tool and IFSP to align with the new IDEA, Part C regulations, and better document a family's resources, priorities, and	

Improvement Activity	APR Timeline	Indicator(s)	Status	Proposed Changes
<p>interests and desired outcomes and child assessment is contextualized by the routines, activities and relationships that are a natural part of the child's life.</p>			<p>concerns related to their child's development.</p> <p>DES/AzeIP developed and implemented two trainings on the Assessment process and utilization of the AzeIP Child and Family Assessment tool. DES/AzeIP also developed a guide to the Child and Family Assessment for Families.</p> <p>The IFSP Guidance document was revised to provide a description of the process for completing and documenting the child and family assessment process on the corresponding IFSP pages.</p> <p>AzeIP M-TEAMS provided TA discussions/trainings to programs regarding the new child and family assessment process and forms.</p>	
<p>3 Provide targeted and general technical assistance through regional meetings, on-site and phone meetings with M-TEAMS (Technical Assistance and Monitoring Specialists, DDD Liaisons and ASDB Staff) and/or DES/AzeIP staff, written guidance/clarification and other strategies. Technical assistance will address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Family Rights</li> <li>• Transition</li> <li>• Team-based early intervention</li> <li>• Child and Family Assessment</li> <li>• Service Coordination</li> <li>• Financial Matters, including FCP, Medicaid, private</li> </ul>	<p>Ongoing and targeted (1)</p> <p>June 2011, and ongoing (2)</p> <p>July 2011-2012 (7)</p> <p>June 2011, 2012 (9, 10)</p> <p>July 2010-June 2012 (14)</p>	<p>1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14</p>	<p>Targeted, individualized technical assistance provided to early intervention programs by DES/ AzeIP staff and M-TEAMS based on corrective actions, program improvement activities and implementation of policies and/or procedures.</p> <p>DES/AzeIP implemented a series of recorded webinar presentations on new and/or revised Federal Regulations, inclusive of highlighting new practice requirements and changes in applicable forms. These webinars covered the following topics and were posted to the DES/AzeIP: Screening, Eligibility, Transition (including the Child Outcome Summary Form process), IFSP development (including the Child Outcome Summary Form process) and Procedural Safeguards inclusive of funding, consent to use private and/or public insurance</p>	

Improvement Activity	APR Timeline	Indicator(s)	Status	Proposed Changes
<p>insurance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Child Indicators/ Child Indicator Summary Forms</li> <li>• Data Collection and Reporting Requirements</li> </ul>			<p>and consent to share personally identifiable information.</p> <p>DES/AzeIP and the M-TEAMS held a day-long training for the new AzeIP team-based contract administrators, DDD and ASDB administrators to support the statewide transition to Team Based Early Intervention Services in early 2013.</p> <p>DES/AzeIP held a 3 hour, statewide, mandatory webinar for all AzeIP Program Coordinators, early intervention providers, service coordinators, DDD Supervisors, DDD Service Coordinators, ASDB Supervisors, ASDB Teachers of the Visually Impaired, ASDB Teachers of the Deaf and Hearing Impaired, and ASDB Service Coordinators, entitled Overview of Evidence-Based Practices in Early Intervention provided by M’Lisa Shelden and Dathan Rush.</p> <p>DES/AzeIP recruited 8 teams from across the state to participate in a two-day Masters Teams Institute followed by 6 months of coaching</p> <p>The M-TEAMs, conducted trainings and technical assistance meetings with Early Intervention Programs on an individual and regional basis to address the following issues: Assessment, Initial Planning Process, Teaming and Coaching, the Transition Process and Child Records and Retention.</p> <p>DES/AzeIP issued a revised family rights document called, “The Child and Family Rights in the Arizona Early Intervention Program” which is inclusive on the new regulatory requirements effective July 2012.</p>	

Improvement Activity		APR Timeline	Indicator(s)	Status	Proposed Changes
4	Develop and implement follow-up strategies to ensure correct and consistent application of the policies and practices that were the subject of the training, and technical assistance.	December 2012	1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14	DES/AzEIP and the M-TEAMS prepared a TA plan for programs with non-compliance or program improvement needs. That plan includes activities for the program and the M-TEAMS, including regular follow-up communications and document review to ensure appropriate implementation.	
5	Continued implementation of the AzEIP Standards of Practice (SOP) for early intervention professionals to support understanding of early intervention, including natural environments and families' rights and procedural safeguards.	Ongoing  July 2011-2012 (10, 11)	1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 10, 11	Due to changes in the regulations, and resulting changes to AzEIP policies, changes to the SOP are underway.	

### III. Coordination with Early Childhood Partners and Public Awareness

FFY11 SPP/APR Improvement Activities		APR Timeline	Indicator(s)	Status/Comments	Proposed Changes
1.	Work in collaboration with NICU nurses and discharge planning teams to: (i) ensure appropriate referrals with required documentation to determine eligibility; and (ii) to support families in the NICU with referral, eligibility, and/or initial IFSP development as appropriate.	Ongoing	5, 6	The State met its targets: no explanation about improvement strategies required.	
2.	Develop and maintain collaborative partnerships with agencies and organizations and provide information about the nationally recognized key principles and	Ongoing	5, 6	The State met its targets: no explanation about improvement strategies required.	

Improvement Activity	APR Timeline	Indicator(s)	Status	Proposed Changes
<p>practices of early intervention, AzEIP successes, and how and when to make a referral. Partners include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parent organizations</li> <li>• Early Head Start</li> <li>• AZ Department of Education and Schools</li> <li>• AHCCCS</li> <li>• AZ Academy of Pediatrics</li> <li>• Child Care</li> <li>• DES, Division of Children, Youth and Families</li> <li>• First Things First</li> </ul>				
3.	Collect, analyze and utilize public awareness and child find data (e.g., referral source data, child demographics, public awareness materials) to guide efforts.	December 2011, June 2012, 2013	5, 6	The State met its targets: no explanation about improvement strategies required.
4.	AzEIP and ADE Alert System to allow local Part C and Part B representatives to notify their State contacts of compliance issues, which were not able to be resolved at the local level.	Ongoing	8	<p>The Alert System has provided a systematic method for DES/AzEIP and the ADE 619 Coordinator to provide TA to their programs that have been unable or unwilling to resolve issues (e.g., notification of potentially eligible children, scheduling of transition conference to occur between 2.6 - 2.9 years) with their local partners.</p> <p>In response to Alerts received during the year DES/AzEIP, and/or the M-TEAMS, in collaboration with the Arizona Department of Education, held a meeting with the AzEIP</p>

Improvement Activity	APR Timeline	Indicator(s)	Status	Proposed Changes	
				contractors, Division for Developmental Disabilities and Arizona State Schools for the Deaf and the Blind in Tucson with the Tucson Unified School District to address issues related to ensuring a smooth transition for children from Part C to Part B. Meetings were also held in Yuma, Prescott, and Payson.	