State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report: Part C

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

For reporting on FFY18

Arizona

PART C DUE February 3, 2020

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and to ensure that the Lead Agency (LA) meets the requirements of Part C of the IDEA. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

As Lead Agency for Arizona's Early Intervention Program (AzEIP), under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Part C, the Arizona Department of Economic Security (ADES) is required to submit a State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) describing the state's compliance and performance relative to federally-defined indicators. During Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2018, communication, coordination and collaboration increased significantly between the Lead Agency and professionals from Team-Based Early Intervention Services (TBEIS) contractors, the Division for Developmental Disabilities (DDD) Service Coordinators and the Arizona School for the Deaf and Blind (ASDB) employees and sub-contractors.

The FFY 2018 SPP/APR is the sixth submission of the SPP/APR cycle, which includes Federal Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The SSIP is due to be submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) in April 2020. The Lead Agency will report FFY 2018 data on the activities completed towards meeting the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the Lead Agency will provide comprehensive details on the implementation of the SSIP Evaluation Plan.

The reported data in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR details the state's performance relative to the targets, and reflect the level of compliance and performance for the state's 35 early intervention programs (EIPs) active during the reporting period from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019.

Using a Primary Service Provider approach, known as Team-Based Early Intervention Services (TBEIS), the Lead Agency ensures that all eligible children and families are provided with a Core Team of professionals (developmental special instructionists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, speech and language pathologists, social workers, psychologists, and service coordinators) who use Natural Learning Opportunities, Teaming, Coaching, Resource-based Capacity-building and responsive caregiver practices when approaching services. These practices are collectively employed to support primary caregivers to assist their infants and toddlers with disabilities to grow and develop by engaging and participating in everyday routines and activities.

Each local EIP is comprised of Core Team members from one of the Lead Agency's TBEIS contractors, one DDD service coordination unit, and teachers of the visually impaired and teachers of the deaf and hard of hearing from the ASDB regional council. During this reporting period, the Lead Agency sectioned the state into 22 geographical services areas. The geographical service areas had between one and three TBEIS contractors depending on the geographic size, population, and unique needs of the region.

At the beginning of FFY 2018, the Lead Agency contracted with 13 agencies and had one Interagency Governmental Agreement (IGA) with the Navajo Nation for a total of 37 EIPs. In August 2018, two contracts were terminated from one TBEIS contractor by mutual agreement between the Lead Agency and the TBEIS contractor. During the contract termination transition period, new early intervention referrals were rerouted to the ongoing TBEIS contractor in the region, so no service disruption would take place. Children that were already receiving early intervention services were transferred to their newly assigned TBEIS contractor strategically for a seamless transition.

In alignment with Arizona Procurement Code, the Lead Agency was required to go out for a Request for Proposal (RFP) to solicit for a new term of TBEIS contractors. The Arizona Procurement Code regulations are designed to: ensure fair and open competition; guard against favoritism, improvidence, extravagance, fraud and corruption; ensure that the results meet agency needs; provide for checks and balances to regulate and oversee agency procurement activities; and protect the interests of the State and its taxpayers.

The Lead Agency enhanced the Scope of Work for the new TBEIS contracts, effective July 1, 2019. A part of the enhancements includes Performance Based Measures for all the IDEA Part C Federal Indicators. This allows the Lead Agency to have stronger contractual accountability for its TBEIS contractors. The enhancements also include stronger and more precise language on potential contract actions that can be taken for noncompliance, when applicable and appropriate.

The Lead Agency has an IGA with the Navajo Nation for provision of early intervention services, in addition to the TBEIS contractors. The IGA has remained in place with the Navajo Nation through this reporting period.The Lead Agency is currently in the process of updating the IGA to meet the needs and be in alignment with the procured TBEIS contractors service provision requirements and expectations.

The newly identified TBEIS contractors were awarded in Spring 2019. As a result of the RFP process, nine agencies were awarded TBEIS contracts with the Lead Agency. Three agencies providing TBEIS services in FFY 2017 were not awarded contracts with the new solicitation.

The Lead Agency developed a comprehensive,detailed implementation plan for the transition of early intervention services and contract changes. While this plan was strictly adhered to, there were expected challenges that arose from the transition. Any challenges during the transition period were regularly followed up on by Lead Agency staff, who received assurance that all requirements would be followed. Since the previous contracting period ended on June 30, 2019, most EIP leadership were focused on the transition activities such as; off-boarding or on-boarding staff and closing or increasing business operations. Statewide, the Lead Agency experienced some service providers changing positions to work for a newly awarded TBEIS contract which resulted in temporary capacity issues for early intervention service provision. There were extensive efforts made by Lead Agency staff to ensure all services for any children were completed timely and appropriately. Stakeholder's identified that a reason the state did not meet the target for timely services was primarily due to the timing of the monitoring period with the contract transition reducing local Early Intervention Programs' (EIPs) focus on monitoring staff to ensure timely services.

Arizona government is continuing this year to operate within a professional, results-driven management system that focuses on delivering value and achieving our mission. Through the Arizona Management System (AMS), state employees reflect regularly on their performance and key metrics, while always seeking a more efficient and higher quality way to optimize and improve performance. Employees are trained to use tools for data-driven decision-making and disciplined problem solving, which afford them greater creativity and control while expanding their capacity to provide high quality

services and supports.

The Lead Agency has consistently utilized AMS principles and tools since FFY 2015 for continuous improvement efforts. This has proven to be effective in supporting EIPs through its general supervision system. AMS has allowed the Lead Agency to streamline feedback from EIPs and stakeholders to ensure more effective TA and by improving communication with colleagues to ensure they have the information they need to make informed decisions. AMS provides structure so the Lead Agency can better support EIPs allowing them to focus on their work of improving results for families in early intervention.

General Supervision System

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

As part of its General Supervision responsibilities, the Lead Agency ensures the following requirements are met:

1. Monitoring the implementation of the statewide early intervention system;

2. Making annual determinations of each EIP using the four categories designated by the United States Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) as to the program's implementation of the requirements of IDEA, Part C: (1) meets requirements; (2) needs assistance;(3) needs intervention; and (4) needs substantial intervention. Local determinations are made available to the public on the Lead Agency's website; and

3. Enforcing the requirements of IDEA, Part C using appropriate, required enforcement mechanisms, as described in Chapter Two, General Supervision of AzEIP's Policies and Procedures located at: <https://des.az.gov/services/disabilities/early-intervention/azeip-policies-and-procedures>.

The Lead Agency establishes and executes integrated monitoring activities, which ensure that the regulations set forth in the IDEA, Part C are effectively implemented statewide. The integrated monitoring activities focus on: improving early intervention results and functional outcomes for all IDEA, Part C eligible children and their families; and ensuring that each EIP meets regulatory requirements for both compliance and results indicators established under IDEA, Part C.

The Lead Agency carries out its general supervision system through the implementation and oversight of the following: SPP/APR; annual 618 reports; AzEIP Policies and Procedures; contractual agreements; interagency governmental agreements; memorandums of understanding; Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD); data processes and results; integrated monitoring activities; contract and sub-recipient monitoring; dispute resolution; technical assistance (TA) system; and fiscal monitoring .

Effective monitoring strategies are integrated across all components of the general supervision system to ensure data collection from EIPs on all SPP/APR indicators, which includes both compliance and results indicators. The integrated monitoring activities include collection, review and analysis of an EIP's data on SPP/APR related requirements, contract management, reviewing fiscal data, and other state identified priority areas. The Lead Agency's integrated monitoring activities are: (a) multi-faceted, seeking to improve both compliance and program performance; and (b) coordinated with its other systems, including CSPD and TA.

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

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

The Lead Agency reviews and verifies each EIP's data annually. This review and verification process may include: self-report data from a specified period of time; electronic data from a specified period of time; Child and Family Outcome data; and dispute resolution data. EIPs have the responsibility to ensure their data and documentation are complete and accurate. The Lead Agency runs a final report for the purpose of monitoring to identify noncompliance.

EIPs participating in self-reporting do so on a three-year cycle at a minimum, or more frequently if required by the Lead Agency. The Lead Agency gathers and analyzes all required data and notifies programs of the files selected for verification. Upon notification, EIPs submit all documentation for verification to the Lead Agency where the files are then reviewed by Lead Agency Staff to verify timeliness, completeness, and accuracy of the data submitted.

Based on the review and analysis of all data sources, the Lead Agency issues written notifications to each EIP within 90 days of identification of noncompliance which includes an individualized corrective action plan, and the decision for an on-site visit by the Lead Agency

Selection of EIPs for on-site visits is based on multiple factors including, but not limited to; most recent review of electronic data; dispute resolution data; the extent and level of compliance and noncompliance; past correction of noncompliance or continuing noncompliance; geographic location of the EIP; program size; program practices; date of latest on-site visit; and local determinations for each EIP. Additionally, EIPs can be selected for an on-site visit outside of the monitoring cycle.

Each EIP receives at least one on-site visit during a three-year cycle. The focus of the on-site visit is to review existing data and gather additional data needed to determine the root cause(s) of identified noncompliance. Lead Agency Staff utilize the Local Contributing Factor tool and meaningful improvement strategies with EIPs to correct noncompliance and ensure improved outcomes for children and families. In addition to the regular monitoring during the three-year cycle, if noncompliance is identified through the dispute resolution processes, the Lead Agency notifies the EIP of the finding of noncompliance and required corrective actions to the EIP.

Based on the extent, level, and root cause of the EIP's noncompliance, the Lead Agency issues required corrective actions that must be completed as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the date of the written notification.

Corrective action must include benchmarks, implementation activities, and timelines to address all local contributing factors to ensure timely and effective correction of the noncompliance. Lead Agency Staff partner closely with the EIP to ensure the actions that are determined will have a meaningful impact for sustainability. As outlined in the OSEP 09-02 Memo, the Lead Agency requires EIPs to submit documentation of child specific correction and subsequent data that reflects programmatic correction for each area of noncompliance for verification of the correction and subsequent implementation of the regulatory requirement for the EIP. The Lead Agency ensures that noncompliance is corrected as soon as possible, and no later

than one year from the identification of the noncompliance, by providing EIPs with support offered through its TA System.

Each EIP receives a local determination on an annual basis using data from the prior fiscal year, including the most recent data from the SPP/APR, valid and reliable data, correction of noncompliance, dispute resolution data and any other relevant information. The Lead Agency notifies the EIP in writing of its determination and required actions, when applicable. Local EIP performance data available to the public on the Lead Agency's website. The Lead Agency may also distribute local performance data to the ICC and other stakeholder groups.

Technical Assistance System:

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

The Lead Agency's TA System supports the early intervention community throughout the state and provides guidance and assistance to its EIP's to enhance service providers knowledge and adherence of IDEA, Part C, AzEIP Policies and Procedures, and evidence-based practices. In addition to this, the TA System responds to multi-agency statewide initiatives and ensures the effective distribution of accurate information is shared. TA needs are identified through general supervision, Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD), community engagement and partnership regarding the work of early intervention, and related identified statewide initiatives. TA is provided through a variety of means to ensure that the assimilation and application of information is provided to and practiced by the broader early childhood community . The overall purpose of the TA System is to provide programs the opportunity to enhance their confidence and competence in providing early intervention supports and services using evidence-based practices in accordance with federal law, the AzEIP Policies and Procedures, and to collaborate with other early childhood programs.

The Lead Agency's TA System collaborates very closely with various statewide early childhood systems. These collaborations ensure we reach all important recipients of specific TA, we maximize participation and coordination by all appropriate state agencies and community partners, and ensure the same high quality information is shared across all sectors. This increased communication, collaboration, and coordination results in a multitude of successes for our TA System. One example of this, is how the Lead Agency successfully partnered this past year with community partners and other state agencies to host a Neonatal Abstinence Syndrome (NAS) training for early intervention and home visiting personnel, ensuring that providers felt confident in supporting families impacted by NAS. Additionally, in partnership of the Arizona Department of Health Services, the Governor's Office of Youth, Faith and Family, and subject matter experts, the Part C Coordinator helped develop a series of four training modules for Professionals on NAS. This outreach is critical for the Lead Agency's Child Find activities, as the number of babies with Neonatal Abstinence Syndrome continues to rise.

The recipients of TA activities and resources are not exclusive to early intervention providers and provided to the broader community . Some primary recipients include, but are not limited to: all key early intervention personnel,administrators, directors and management from local EIPs, critical staff from Arizona's five state agencies that comprise the early intervention system, staff from Arizona's IDEA Part B and D programs, early childhood community partners; primary referral sources, Head Start Programs, staff from the Arizona Department of Child Safety, and families.

Lead Agency Staff provide TA through: written materials and guidance documents, in-person during onsite visits, coaching or consultation in-person, by telephone, e-mail, phone or video conferencing, in-service trainings, regional, statewide and topic specific work groups, feedback groups, conferences, meetings, community presentations, Early Childhood Conferences, and web-based information sharing sessions. The Lead Agency sets statewide and local TA priorities based upon IDEA, Part C priorities, state initiatives, state monitoring findings, and current research findings.

The Lead Agency evaluates the TA System by: administering immediate impact assessments gathered from participants, evaluating implementation of specific TA while providing guidance as needed, evaluating the sustainable and long-term impact on the early intervention system,reviewing and comparing monitoring data against desired TA outcomes to determine level of progress and identify any correction and adjustment that may be needed, and responding to any statewide TA requests.

Professional Development System:

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

The Lead Agency coordinates and maintains a Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) that includes the following components:
• In-service;
• Pre-service;
• Recruitment and Retention;
• Personnel Standards;
• Leadership; and
• Sustainability.

The CSPD infrastructure is based on the framework developed by the Early Childhood Personnel Center (ECPC). Arizona is participating as an intensive technical assistance state with ECPC to continue to improve the quality of the CSPD to improve results for children and families served by AzEIP.

The Lead Agency offers online courses, materials, resources and in person courses to support early intervention professionals in providing quality services that improve results for infants and toddlers. Additionally, trainings and resources are sent regularly to EIPs and practitioners for ongoing inservice training. In addition to inservice supports, the Lead Agency requires that all EIPs ensure they hire qualified personnel as outlined in the AzEIP Policy Manual.

The Lead Agency's service providing agencies maintain personnel files for their employees or contractors who provide early intervention services to document that they meet all current professional and the Lead Agency's personnel qualifications. Early intervention professionals are contractually responsible for knowing and complying with the Lead Agency's personnel qualifications policies. All the Lead Agency's service providing agencies are required to ensure that early intervention professionals complete the ADES required trainings, and meet the Lead Agency's personnel qualifications. Information may be reviewed at any time or as a part of the Lead Agency's integrated monitoring activities.

Stakeholder Involvement:

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP/APR, and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 11, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

The FFY 2018 SPP/APR was developed with extensive stakeholder engagement throughout the year. Engagement was gathered through work groups, Inter-agency meetings, and Interagency Coordinating Council for Infants and Toddlers (ICC) meetings. Lead Agency staff also facilitated an annual stakeholders meeting on November 15, 2019, where targets, data and root causes for progress or slippage were discussed. Stakeholders were able to provide in-person, phone, or written feedback on targets and data. This annual stakeholders meeting included individuals representing very broad early childhood perspectives . This year, participating stakeholders included: parents and family members of children with disabilites, early intervention statewide leaders, service coordinators, therapists, staff from the ADES/DDD, ASDB, IDEA Part B representatives, the representatives from the State's

Medicaid program Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System (AHCCCS) and local health plans, other state agency partners including the Arizona Department of Health Services Office of Children with Special Healthcare Needs, early childhood partners including First Things First, Early Head Start, and home visitation grantees. Stakeholder feedback from all these groups was critical to making revisions to targets and drafting the narrative for this year's SPP/APR.

In addition to statewide stakeholder engagement, the Lead Agency has received extensive support from national TA centers including the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA), the IDEA Data Center (IDC), the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy Center), NCSI, and the Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE). The Lead Agency staff have regular calls and engagement with TA providers to discuss strategies regarding analysis of each indicator and potential improvement strategies. The Lead Agency participated in the data processes toolkit meetings and monthly follow-up with IDC to support with reporting requirements starting with Indicator 1, Timely Services, and Indicator 7, 45-day Timeline The Lead Agency is also participating in Intensive TA through monthly phone calls with the DaSy Center around data linking processes. The DaSy Center's TA has supported with Arizona's IDEA, Part B State Education Agency (the State's SEA) at the Arizona Department of Education as well as with the Early Hearing Detection and Intervention program at Arizona Department of Health Services. As a result of receiving TA support, the Lead Agency implemented internal improvement strategies as well as provided additional quality TA to local EIPs for continuous improvement.

The Lead Agency received an on-site visit from OSEP in April 2019, in part, due to compliance around transition activities. The Lead Agency received support from ECTA, IDC, DaSy Center, and NCSI in order to prepare for the visit. As a result of the on-site visit, the relationship between Part C and Part B staff was strengthened. The joint technical assistance from the DaSy Center on linking transition data provided to the Lead Agency and Part B 619 Coordinator was expanded to also include the Part B State Director and Data Manager. The Lead Agency and SEA have begun planning the scope of technological improvements to link transition data to strengthen each program's ability to effectively monitor and make substantial and meaningful long-term improvements. The Lead Agency is pleased to report continued improvement toward compliance with transition activities due to the OSEP on-site visit and TA received.

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

NO

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2017 performance of each EIS Program located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2017 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, is available.

The Lead Agency reports to the public on the performance of each local EIP on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its APR. The Lead Agency posted a complete copy of both a report on the performance of each local EIP and the State's FFY 2017 SPP/APR submission with FFY 2018 targets at <https://des.az.gov/services/disabilities/developmental-infant/azeip-publications-and-reports>. With feedback from stakeholders and their recommendation, targets were continued as previously set for the FFY 2018 submission. Initially, the Lead Agency sent a mass e-mail to 1,229 stakeholders announcing the availability of these reports on the Lead Agency's website. When appropriate, the Lead Agency also directed the general public to the reports posted on the website during community outreach.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

Intro - OSEP Response

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Fanily Service Plans(IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Include the State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select early intervention service (EIS) programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. States report in both the numerator and denominator under Indicator 1 on the number of children for whom the State ensured the timely initiation of new services identified on the IFSP. Include the timely initiation of new early intervention services from both initial IFSPs and subsequent IFSPs. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

The State's timeliness measure for this indicator must be either: (1) a time period that runs from when the parent consents to IFSP services; or (2) the IFSP initiation date (established by the IFSP Team, including the parent).

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in the Office of Special Education Programs' (OSEP's) response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	48.00%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	82.19%	74.83%	84.96%	86.64%	91.95%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
493	571	91.95%	100%	92.47%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

35

Include your State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

The Lead Agency policies include Arizona Part C's definition of "timely" receipt of early intervention services. "An early intervention service is timely if it begins on or before the planned start date on the Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP), but no later than 45 days from the date the family consents to the service (i.e., signs the IFSP), unless the service has a planned start date greater than 45 days from the date of the IFSP. In these instances, the service is timely if it starts on or before the planned start date."

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

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

The Lead Agency uses a three-year monitoring cycle requiring self-reporting followed by verification. Early Intervention Programs (EIPs) represented in this year's cycle, Cohort Three, provide services to children and their families in multiple areas of the state including urban, suburban, rural, and tribal areas. The monitoring cycle was originally developed by the Lead Agency and considered the following factors to ensure each area of the state and varying program sizes are included in each year of the three-year cycle for the self-reporting requirement: most recent review of electronic data and dispute resolution data; correction of noncompliance; geographic location; and program size. Data reviewed for Cohort Three (or the third year of a three-year cycle) includes state monitoring data for ten EIPs across seven of the 22 regions in Arizona.

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

XXX

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

XXX

If needed, provide additional information about this indicator here.

Data represent 571 IFSPs, all with either an initial Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs) or a subsequent IFSP with a new service added during the monitoring period of April 1, 2019 through June 30, 2019. Data for children in the monitoring period are representative of state demographics, including those children that are served by both small and large EIPs as well as urban, suburban, rural, and tribal populations. Timely services data were obtained through a combination of state database information and self-report by the EIPs. The Lead Agency verified data through file reviews for ten percent of the files.

Most infants and toddlers with IFSPs received their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. A total of 493 of 571 IFSPs for children were timely with an additional 35 children who had a delay due to exceptional family circumstances. Only 33 children did not receive timely early intervention services. Reasons for delay include:
• Team did not provide documents showing visit occurred or did not complete visit for 21 IFSPs
• No documentation of the delay reason for 15 IFSPs
• Scheduling difficulty between team members for 3 IFSPs
• Team member cancelled visit for 2 IFSPs
• Planned start date listed as date of IFSP when team member did not stay afterwards for 1 IFSP
• Capacity issue for 1 IFSP

Stakeholders, including EIP leaders, identified that the primary reason the state did not meet the target for timely services was due to the timing of the monitoring period with the contract transition reducing local Early Intervention Programs' (EIPs) focus on monitoring staff to ensure timely services. Some EIP leaders around the state were focused on off-boarding staff and closing business operations for early intervention programs as contracts ended on June 30, 2019. Other EIP leaders were preparing to hire, on-board staff, and increase infrastructure for the new contracts awarded on July 1, 2019. Some therapists and service coordinators were changing from one agency to another during the transition resulting in temporary capacity issues to provide services and follow-up to ensure services would begin on time.

In December of 2018, the Lead Agency launched data system enhancements to streamline collection of timely services data. Prior to the enhancements, the Lead Agency collected approximately 43 percent of timely service information through the statewide database, which increased to approximately 66 percent after the data system enhancements. The Lead Agency expects this percent to continue to increase based on providing additional TA to EIPs on accurately reporting the data. With more data available, the Lead Agency began work to increase reporting capabilities of the data system in the next federal fiscal year, which will allow local EIP leadership and service coordinators to make more consistent data-driven decisions to more easily and effectively monitor IFSPs for timely services.

The Lead Agency issues findings of noncompliance to programs that do not meet 100 percent compliance for timely services. The Lead Agency reviews corrective action plans and supports EIPs in effective and timely correction of noncompliance. All instances of child-specific noncompliance are tracked by Lead Agency Staff to ensure correction and that, although late, the individual children's IFSP was developed consistent with the OSEP 09-02 memo on timely corrections. EIPs are required to submit file reviews to Lead Agency Staff to verify the program is performing at 100 percent for timely IFSPs. For all EIPs, the Lead Agency offers TA and provides tracking tools to support with improvement on timely IFSPs. Additionally, the Lead Agency supports EIPs with developing individualized training plans to support their providers.

This year, findings of noncompliance were issued to local EIPs. Findings of noncompliance were not issued to four programs with noncompliance as they no longer have contracts to provide early intervention services with the Lead Agency, therefore programmatic correction of noncompliance would not be applicable. The Lead Agency verified that the children receiving services from these four programs either received their services late or exited from those programs. The children that exited from programs that closed will continue to be tracked by the Lead Agency to ensure that services have started, although late, with the newly assigned program. Performance Based Metrics for Timely Services were included as a critical component of the new awards for Team-Based Early Intervention Services contracts effective July 1, 2019.

The list below shows the number of programs grouped by compliance level for Timely Services:
• No programs with 100 percent compliance
• Five programs with compliance between 90-99 percent
• Three programs with compliance between 80-89 percent
• One program with compliance between 70-79 percent
• One program with compliance below 70 percent

As outlined in the OSEP 09-02 memo, the Lead Agency requires EIPs to submit documentation of child specific correction and subsequent data that reflect correction for each area of noncompliance for verification of the correction and subsequent implementation of the regulatory requirement for the

entire program. The Lead Agency ensures the EIP is implementing the regulatory requirement through on-site visits, requesting documents and notes from the file submitted through mail or e-mail, and reviewing current data submitted in the statewide database. The Lead Agency ensures that noncompliance is corrected as soon as possible, and no later than one year from the identification of the noncompliance, by providing EIPs with support offered through its TA System.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
9	7	2	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Based on findings of noncompliance, EIPs were placed on a tiered corrective action plan. EIP leaders were required to work across agency lines to submit a root cause analysis for the noncompliance and detailed, individualized plans for addressing the causes of their noncompliance. The Lead Agency conducted TA webinars on federal requirements for this indicator. The Lead Agency mandated attendance for all EIP staff with noncompliance and optional attendance for EIPs that were compliant.. The Lead Agency requested periodic updates from EIPs on their corrective action plans in order to monitor progress EIP. EIP leaders were required to conduct file reviews on currently open cases and submit the records, including service coordinator progress notes as well eligibility and IFSP documentation, to the Lead Agency for verification. Lead Agency Staff reviewed current data and information from the file reviews for five to fifteen percent of the EIPs' current caseloads to verify each EIP was implementing regulatory requirements at 100 percent consistent with the OSEP 09-02 memo.

Nine findings of noncompliance were issued in FFY 2017. The Lead Agency verified the nine EIPs with findings of noncompliance had demonstrated both correction of all instances of child-specific noncompliance and demonstrated that they were implementing the regulatory requirements at 100 percent. Most of the programs, seven of the nine, were able to demonstrate timely correction of the noncompliance within one year. Two programs were able to subsequently demonstrate correction of noncompliance shortly after one year from the date the findings of noncompliance were issued.

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

EIPs were required to submit data to the Lead Agency to verify individual cases of noncompliance have been corrected. Lead Agency staff reviewed files including the state database, IFSPs, home visit logs, and service coordinator progress notes for all 62 individual cases to determine all services on the IFSP were provided, although late, or were no longer within Part C. Of the 62 individual cases, services eventually started for 45 children, although late, and 17 children were exited from Part C before all services had started.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (*EMAPS*)).

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's 618 data reported in Table 2. If not, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	86.00%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target>=	89.00%	90.00%	91.00%	92.00%	93.00%
Data	94.67%	98.21%	97.96%	97.62%	98.03%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=	94.50%	97.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

The FFY 2018 SPP/APR was developed with extensive stakeholder engagement throughout the year. Engagement was gathered through work groups, inter-agency meetings, and Interagency Coordinating Council for Infants and Toddlers (ICC) meetings. Lead Agency staff also facilitated an annual stakeholders meeting on November 15, 2019, where targets, data and root causes for progress or slippage were discussed. Stakeholders were able to provide in-person, phone, or written feedback on targets and data. This annual stakeholders meeting included individuals representing very broad early childhood perspectives . This year, participating stakeholders included: parents and family members of children with disabilites, early intervention statewide leaders, service coordinators, therapists, staff from the Arizona Department of Economic Security (ADES)/Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD), Arizona State Schools for the Deaf and Blind (ASDB), IDEA Part B representatives, the representatives from the State's Medicaid program Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System (AHCCCS) and local health plans, other state agency partners including the Arizona Department of Health Services Office of Children with Special Healthcare Needs, early childhood partners including First Things First, Early Head Start, and home visitation grantees. Stakeholder feedback from all these groups was critical to making revisions to targets and drafting the narrative for this year's SPP/APR. The Lead Agency also solicited feedback from stakeholders on targets for FFY 2019. Most stakeholders recommended a more rigorous target for settings for FFY 2019. The Lead Agency has submitted a new, increased target for FFY 2019 at the recommendation of a majority of stakeholders.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	5,949
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	5,980

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of Infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
5,949	5,980	98.03%	94.50%	99.48%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

During the annual Stakeholders Meeting on November 15, 2019, stakeholders provided detailed input as to what they attribute the strengths are and the reasons Arizona continues to have a high percentage of children receiving early intervention services in the home or community based settings. Stakeholders commented that families are provided services in their preferred environments and convenient locations making services more attainable and accessible. One stakeholder reported this is an indication that “inclusion is happening early and well in Arizona” for children birth through to age three. In alignment with Key Principles of Early Intervention, stakeholders report that more infants and toddlers receiving services in natural environments with familiar people in familiar contexts which another stakeholder stated “should lead to more positive outcomes and learning.” Services provided in home and community based settings have increased as a result of the implementation of team-based early intervention services. The Lead Agency continues to train providers on natural learning opportunities in a child's everyday routine in familiar places such as homes, child care centers, and the community in addition to new providers becoming trained as they are hired. The focus on natural learning opportunities enables all providers to learn evidence-based practices that support infants and toddlers learning through everyday experiences and interactions with familiar people in familiar contexts of their home and community.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

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

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

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

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

d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in category (d)) divided by (# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

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

Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e)) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of infants and toddlers with IFSPs is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement, include in the numerator and denominator only infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Report: (1) the number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's Part C exiting data under Section 618 of the IDEA; and (2) the number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements.

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Process (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

If the State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i), the State must report data in two ways. First, it must report on all eligible children but exclude its at-risk infants and toddlers (i.e., include just those infants and toddlers experiencing developmental delay (or "developmentally delayed children") or having a diagnosed physical or mental condition that has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay (or "children with diagnosed conditions")). Second, the State must separately report outcome data on either: (1) just its at-risk infants and toddlers; or (2) aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C (including developmentally delayed children, children with diagnosed conditions, and at-risk infants and toddlers).

3 - Indicator Data

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

In addition to statewide stakeholder engagement, the Lead Agency has received extensive support from national technical assistance (TA) centers including the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA), the IDEA Data Center (IDC), the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy Center), the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and the Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE). The Lead Agency staff have regular calls and engagement with TA providers to discuss strategies regarding analysis of each indicator and potential improvement strategies. The Lead Agency participated in the data processes toolkit meetings and monthly follow-up with IDC to support with reporting requirements starting with Indicator 1, Timely Services, and Indicator 7, 45-day Timeline. As a result of receiving TA support, the Lead Agency implemented internal improvement strategies as well as provided additional quality TA to local EIPs for continuous improvement.

The Lead Agency also participated in intensive TA through monthly phone calls with the DaSy Center around data linking processes. The DaSy Center's TA has supported with the Early Hearing Detection and Intervention program at Arizona Department of Health Services to answer critical questions around supports provided for children that are deaf or hard of hearing.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2014	Target>=	65.00%	65.00%	72.01%	72.01%	72.01%
A1	72.01%	Data	71.73%	72.01%	72.48%	72.31%	70.86%
A2	2014	Target>=	58.00%	58.00%	53.25%	53.25%	53.25%
A2	53.25%	Data	55.36%	53.25%	53.71%	53.84%	56.17%
B1	2014	Target>=	73.00%	73.00%	77.61%	77.61%	77.61%
B1	77.61%	Data	74.70%	77.61%	76.65%	77.29%	76.44%
B2	2014	Target>=	50.50%	50.50%	53.75%	53.75%	53.75%
B2	53.75%	Data	54.71%	53.75%	53.78%	55.74%	56.56%
C1	2014	Target>=	73.00%	73.00%	76.81%	76.81%	76.81%
C1	76.81%	Data	75.90%	76.81%	78.71%	77.15%	77.11%
C2	2014	Target>=	50.50%	50.50%	47.21%	47.21%	47.21%
C2	47.21%	Data	53.58%	47.21%	47.64%	48.51%	48.89%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1>=	72.74%	72.74%
Target A2>=	53.98%	53.98%
Target B1>=	78.26%	78.26%
Target B2>=	54.48%	54.48%
Target C1>=	77.45%	77.45%
Target C2>=	47.94%	47.94%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

4,330

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	41	0.99%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	911	22.10%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	869	21.08%

	Number of children	Percentage of Total
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,377	33.41%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	924	22.42%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,246	3,198	70.86%	72.74%	70.23%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,301	4,122	56.17%	53.98%	55.82%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	27	0.66%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	858	20.82%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	922	22.37%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,659	40.25%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	656	15.91%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,581	3,466	76.44%	78.26%	74.47%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,315	4,122	56.56%	54.48%	56.16%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable

The Lead Agency has been implementing infrastructure improvements as a part of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) including an update to the Child Outcomes Summary Form (known as the Child Indicators form). Due to the update and additional training and support provided, fluctuations in the data are expected. Lead Agency Staff will be completing further analysis of this indicator to identify any additional causes of fluctuation. The change in process is likely to have caused slippage in this indicator due to better use of tools and training across EIPs.

Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	32	0.78%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	826	20.04%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,232	29.89%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,586	38.48%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	446	10.82%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,818	3,676	77.11%	77.45%	76.66%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,032	4,122	48.89%	47.94%	49.30%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

XXX

Historical Data

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

B2	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B2 AR	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B2 AR	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C1	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C1	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C1 AR	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C1 AR	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C2	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C2	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C2 AR	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C2 AR	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Targets

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

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

XXX

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

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

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	XXX	XXX

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

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for A1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for A2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

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

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX

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

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for B1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for B2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	XXX	XXX

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

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

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for C1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for C2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

The number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's part C exiting 618 data	5,718
The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.	928

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

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

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

Provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers."

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

The Lead Agency uses the ECO COS process to gather data for this outcome. The COS Tool has been adapted for the Lead Agency and has been incorporated into the IFSP process.

Data regarding child outcomes are, at a minimum, gathered at the initial IFSP and at exit from the AzEIP program by the IFSP team. The IFSP team reviews relevant information and assesses the child's functioning in relation to same-age peers during the initial IFSP and records the information on the COS page on the IFSP. The team utilizes a decision tree and multiple sources of information to determine the rating. After the rating is completed, the service coordinator enters the ratings in the Lead Agency's data system. During the annual review or periodic reviews, as appropriate, teams may update the child's COS rating on the IFSP. The service coordinator enters the final COS rating upon exit into the Lead Agency's data system. The data system generates a monthly COS report which EIP leaders use to verify data accuracy and program improvement. The Lead Agency uses this data as a part of monitoring, public reporting and SPP/APR reporting.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

As a part of SSIP improvement strategies, Lead Agency staff have been working with SiMR pilot regions to implement consistent quality practices related to COS data collection and documentation. A survey was sent to teams in SSIP pilot regions regarding strengths and areas of opportunity regarding the COS process in AZ using the Child Outcomes Summary-Team Collaboration (COS-TC) checklist. A smaller stakeholder group within the SSIP pilot regions consisting of Early Intervention Program managers, service coordinators and supervisors analyzed the data and developed a plan to pilot a new COS form and improve quality and consistency of practices. Due to process improvements and focused attention on data quality, there have been small fluctuations in the Child Outcomes data. However, data completeness remains high. The Lead Agency is reporting child outcome data on 86 percent of the children exiting during the year who received services for six months or more.

3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3 - OSEP Response

3 - Required Actions

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

A. Know their rights;

B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and

C. Help their children develop and learn.

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

Data Source

State selected data source. State must describe the data source in the SPP/APR.

Measurement

A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

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

C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of families participating in Part C is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of families to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the infant or toddler, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the families responding are not representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to families (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person), if a survey was used, and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

4 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2006	Target>=	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%
A	94.00%	Data	97.50%	95.37%	90.74%	94.39%	94.42%
B	2006	Target>=	93.50%	93.50%	94.00%	94.50%	95.00%
B	95.00%	Data	95.01%	94.34%	93.55%	92.41%	91.86%
C	2006	Target>=	93.50%	94.00%	94.50%	95.00%	95.50%
C	96.00%	Data	98.40%	95.72%	93.41%	95.40%	95.15%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A>=	94.50%	94.50%
Target B>=	95.50%	95.50%
Target C>=	96.25%	96.25%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

The Lead Agency has relied heavily on the specific Stakeholder Input from the ICC Family Outcomes committee, which meets regularly and has been considering making recommendations for revising the State's collection tool. They are researching the best approach to possible revisions and have not yet made recommendations to change the collection tool. The ICC Family Outcomes committee and a majority of the Lead Agency's primary stakeholders recommend keeping targets the same for FFY 2019 as there were no changes to the collection tool and no significant changes to the

collection process. Stakeholders would also like to see the State's performance on Family Outcomes continue to improve and meet the target before adjusting the target.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	5,713
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	908
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	854
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	894
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	834
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	883
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	855
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	891

	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2)	94.42%	94.50%	95.53%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2)	91.86%	95.50%	94.45%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2)	95.15%	96.25%	95.96%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for part A slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for part B slippage, if appilcable

XXX

Provide reasons for part C slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

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

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

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

While the surveys that were returned are generally representative for ethnicities and most races, the representativeness for counties remains an area of focus for improvement. To address this, the Lead Agency met with EIP State Leaders over the course of the past several fiscal years to enhance fillable areas such as race and ethnicity and sending pre-populated surveys with a unique identifying code. These enhancements have significantly improved the ability to disaggregate the data; however, there are still a small number of surveys with data elements left blank.

The Lead Agency has initiated improvements focusing on increasing the family survey response rate and representativeness. For FFY 2018, to increase

the response rate, the Lead Agency continued an improvement project by mailing surveys across all EIPs. These surveys were coded with a unique identifier which enabled the Lead Agency to track responses, and resend the survey when addresses were incorrect. This unique identifier is only known to Lead Agency staff.

This year, just over 900 surveys were returned, a decrease from last year, but similar to prior years. This decrease can be attributed to increased accuracy of information in the data system, due to the necessity to have a successful contract transition. Two of the survey mailings to families were postponed, due to not wanting to create confusion for families who may have also been receiving mailings associated with the contract transition. Going in to the next year, the number of postal mailings is expected to remain steady.

The survey is available in both English and Spanish versions, the two most common languages in Arizona. To improve representativeness of Hispanic and Latino families, surveys and mailings are offered in both languages to bilingual families so they can determine which language to use for completing the survey. Surveys were also administered by phone in other languages and by family preference.

The Lead Agency has been supporting EIP leadership in historically under-represented , including Pinal and Pima, to improve survey administration to increase response rate in those counties. EIP leadership are actively engaging in family outcomes improvement combined with additional focused support and technical assistance, and the Lead Agency is hopeful there will be marked improvement in representativeness going forward.

With the advise and assistance of the ICC Family Survey committee, the Lead Agency has continued to explore electronic survey applications. The Lead Agency is currently working with the Arizona Department of Economic Security's Office of Procurement to finalize an agreement with the vendor of the electronic survey application. Paper copies of the survey will continue to be made available as an alternative format when it is the family's preferred method of communication or if the family does not have the ability to complete the survey electronically. Moving forward with an electronic survey application will support instant results for local EIPs and the Lead Agency for data informed program improvement and reminders to better target under-represented demographics. The ICC Family Outcomes committee's primary goal of improving representativeness will remain a focus of the work group. They are also exploring the most effective survey administration practices from other states and other agencies within Arizona to advise the Lead Agency on additional improvement strategies to support increasing survey response rates from under-represented races and counties.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.

Lead Agency Staff use The Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA Center) response rate and representativeness calculator to determine the representativeness of completed surveys received in FFY 2018. This ECTA tool uses an accepted statistical formula to determine if the number of surveys received should be considered different from the number of surveys sent, based on a confidence interval of 90 percent. Using the ECTA tool, if the number of surveys received are statistically representative of the number of surveys sent, it is marked as "Yes" in the "Representative Data" column. The tables attached include analysis of representativeness and response rate by various categories including race, ethnicity, and county.

The Lead Agency continues to identify that over time, families identify as different races or ethnicities between time of referral and time of survey completion. Some families in Arizona who self-identify as Hispanic or Latino consider it to be their race rather than ethnicity and do not also identify with one of the federal race categories. This is evidenced by the difference between families that change their race on the survey but not their ethnicity.

Unique to Arizona, there are several counties that do not have adequate access to specialized healthcare. Representativeness of counties may be affected by families who live in rural counties who temporarily stay in a larger city and county during the time their child is receiving significant medical care or extended hospitalizations. Families may identify with one or both counties and receive support from team members from EIP's in both counties during this time, and their responses indicate this unique challenge on accurate representativeness.

Analysis by county shows that a representative number of surveys were received from most counties in Arizona, with two counties over-represented and two counties under represented. Surveys that are hand delivered by programs may be missing demographic information resulting in surveys that could not be associated with any particular EIP or county. It has been noted that while the overall number of surveys with demographics information has increased, the representation of specific EIP's becomes easier to identify. This has led to focused technical assistance and support for the specific EIP's under-represented counties.

The surveys returned to the Lead Agency by families were representative of most races including African American or Black, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and White. Families identifying as more than one race were under-represented by three percent impacting the overall representativeness of race. The Lead Agency will continue to make efforts to improve the representation of families identifying as more than one race by providing technical assistance to programs on accurately capturing race data and increasing the overall response rate of family surveys. Surveys returned by families were representative of both Hispanic and Not-Hispanic ethnicities within one percent of difference. The ECTA Center's representativeness calculator showed that the data were overall representative of both ethnicities.

When analyzing by county, the ECTA Center's response rate and representativeness calculator was adapted for the number of the State's counties. Seven of fifteen of the State's counties had appropriate representation of surveys returned by families including Apache, Cochise, Greenlee, La Paz, Santa Cruz, Yavapai, and Yuma. Counties that were slightly under represented by one percent include Coconino, Gila, Mohave, and Navajo. Counties that were significantly under-represented by six percent include Pima and PInal. Counties with slight over representation include Graham, Yavapai, and Yuma. The State's largest county, Maricopa, was over-represented by 11 percent. Four surveys were returned without a family identifying their county. Overall, the surveys returned were not representative of all the State's counties and will continue to be a focus of improvement strategies.

As mentioned above, the ICC Family Outcomes committee is supporting the Lead Agency in exploring additional options for improving the representativeness of under-represented communities and demographics including electronic and text surveys. Additionally, the Family Outcomes committee is researching the most effective techniques by service coordinators around the state in order to make practice improvement recommendations.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Although the State did not meet the target for the percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs nor for the percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn, during FFY 2018 the State's performance improved compared to the previous year. In July 2018, the Lead Agency made changes to the database used for collection of data on family surveys. Lead Agency Staff hosted a focus group to identify the data that local EIP leadership would need to see on a dashboard to support with further improving Family Outcomes. Based on the feedback provided by the focus group, the Lead Agency will be developing a pilot dashboard for local EIP leadership to have regular access to Family Outcomes data. This will also enable instant notification to EIP leaders and Lead Agency Staff when a family survey is received that requires immediate attention, such as when a family provides positive comments or share a concern. Lead Agency Staff supporting the EIP's will have immediate access to statewide

data and filters by EIP in order to provide tailored TA. The ICC Family Outcomes Committee is also on-board to provide unique feedback and assistance to EIP's for program improvement from family members' perspectives.

4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

4 - OSEP Response

4 - Required Actions

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (*EMAPS*)) and Census (for the denominator).

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	0.59%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target >=	0.64%	0.65%	0.66%	0.67%	0.68%
Data	0.76%	0.89%	0.89%	0.95%	0.91%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	0.69%	0.73%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Each November the Lead Agency's annual stakeholder meeting follows the regularly scheduled ICC meeting to leverage and maximize stakeholder participation. Notification of the annual Stakeholders Meeting is sent out to the ICC members, the ICC Committee members and the broader early childhood community, as well as posted on the Lead Agency's website. The focus of the annual meeting is to review and discuss current SPP/APR targets, and stakeholders are provided an opportunity to set, propose changes, or accept the current targets. The State then adjusts the targets to include proposed and agreed upon changes. In November 2018, stakeholders recommended keeping the Child Find targets the same for FFY 2018 but requested additional information regarding changing targets for FFY 2019. During the most current stakeholder meeting occurring on November 15, 2019, stakeholders reviewed additional information, and a majority of stakeholders recommended increasing the target for FFY 2019 due to the number of children within the state with potentially eligible conditions like Neonatal Abstinence Syndrome and Autism. Stakeholders indicated a hesitancy to increase the rigor of the target too much during the annual stakeholder's meeting in November due to the comparisons with national data not being available at that time. The Lead Agency increased the target for FFY 2019, with stakeholder input, to 0.73 percent.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	767
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/20/2019	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	83,553

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
767	83,553	0.91%	0.69%	0.92%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Compare your results to the national data

Arizona is the 14th most populous state in terms of children, birth to age one and is in the top 40 states and outlying areas serving the highest percent of infants, birth to age one compared to national data.

In the "'17 Child Count Data Charts" table located at <https://www.ideainfanttoddler.org/pdf/2017-Child-Count-Data-Charts.pdf>, the IDEA Infant and Toddler Coordinator's Association (ITCA) identifies 16 other states with strict eligibility criteria similar to Arizona. Of the 16 states that have adopted strict eligibility criteria, state definitions of delay include include:

• 33 percent delay in two or more domains;
• 40 percent delay in one domain;
• 50 percent delay in one domain;
• 1.5 standard deviations in two or more domains;
• 1.75 standard deviations in one domain;
• Two standard deviations in one domain; and
• Two standard deviations in two or more domains.

The State's definition of developmental delay includes a child that has not reached 50 percent of the developmental milestones expected at their chronological age, in one or more developmental domains. Other language to clarify the State's definition of delay would be a significant delay or two standard deviations in one or more developmental domains. The State's definition of an eligible child does not include a child who is "at risk" of having substantial developmental delays if early intervention services are not provided.

The Lead Agency compared the ITCA table with the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) table on "States' and territories' definitions of/criteria for IDEA Part C eligibility", <https://ectacenter.org/~pdfs/topics/earlyid/partc_elig_table.pdf>. States with broader definitions of developmental delay or states that include "at risk" children in their Child Find activities would naturally find more children eligible than Arizona. The State found more children eligible birth to age one, by percentage, than six other states with strict eligibility criteria and five states with broader definitions eligibility.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State continues to see a significant number of children referred for Part C services that do not meet the State's criteria for eligibility. Approximately, 66 percent of children referred to the Lead Agency are not eligible. Stakeholders attribute the success of Child Find birth to age one to identifying infants at an early age and receiving referrals from the Smooth Way Home Fragile Infant Project for children in the Newborn Intensive Care Unit. Rising numbers of infants with Neonatal Abstinance Syndrome within the State account for referrals to the Lead Agency for Part C services at an earlier age. Substantiated cases of abuse through the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) account for a significant portion of referrals of children but most referred to the State's Part C program do not meet the state's definition of developmental delay in the absence of other eligible conditions.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under IDEA section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (*EMAPS*)) and Census (for the denominator).

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

6 - Indicator Data

Baseline	2005	1.61%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target >=	1.87%	1.87%	1.88%	1.88%	1.89%
Data	1.94%	2.09%	2.09%	2.10%	2.22%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	1.89%	1.95%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Each November, the regularly scheduled ICC meeting includes the Lead Agency's stakeholder meeting. Notification of the stakeholders meeting is sent out to the ICC members, the ICC Committee members and the broader early childhood community. The focus of the annual meeting is to review and discuss current SPP/APR targets, and stakeholders are provided an opportunity to set, propose changes, or accept the current targets. The State then adjusts the targets to include proposed and agreed upon changes. In November 2018, stakeholders recommended keeping the Child Find targets the same for FFY 2018 but requested additional information regarding changing targets for FFY 2019. During the most current stakeholder meeting occurring on November 15, 2019, stakeholders reviewed additional information and a majority of stakeholders recommended increasing the target for FFY 2019 due to the number of children within the state with potentially eligible conditions like Neonatal Abstinence Syndrome and Autism. Stakeholders indicated a hesitancy to greatly increase the rigor of the target at the annual stakeholder's meeting in November due to the comparisons with national data not being available at that time. The Lead Agency increased the target for FFY 2019, with stakeholder input, to 1.95 percent.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	5,980
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/20/2019	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	255,977

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
5,980	255,977	2.22%	1.89%	2.34%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Compare your results to the national data

Arizona is the 14th most populous state in terms of children, birth to age three and is in the top 46 states and outlying areas serving the highest percent of infants, birth to age one compared to national data.

In the "'17 Child Count Data Charts" table located at <https://www.ideainfanttoddler.org/pdf/2017-Child-Count-Data-Charts.pdf>, the IDEA Infant and Toddler Coordinator's Association (ITCA) identifies 16 other states with strict eligibility criteria similar to Arizona. Of the 16 states that have adopted strict eligibility criteria, state definitions of delay include include:
• 33 percent delay in two or more domains;
• 40 percent delay in one domain;
• 50 percent delay in one domain;

• 1.5 standard deviations in two or more domains;
• 1.75 standard deviations in one domain;
• Two standard deviations in one domain; and
• Two standard deviations in two or more domains.

Arizona's definition of developmental delay includes a child that has not reached 50 percent of the developmental milestones expected at their chronological age, in one or more developmental domains. Other language to clarify Arizona's definition of delay would be a significant delay, standard score of 70, or two standard deviations in one or more developmental domains. The state's definition of an eligible child does not include a child who is "at risk" of having substantial developmental delays if early intervention services are not provided.

The Lead Agency compared the ITCA table with the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) table on "States' and Territories Definitions of /Criteria for IDEA Part C Eligibility", <https://ectacenter.org/~pdfs/topics/earlyid/partc_elig_table.pdf>. States with broader definitions of developmental delay or states that include "at risk" children in their Child Find activities would naturally find more children eligible than Arizona. The State found more children eligible birth to age three, by percentage, than two other states with strict eligibility criteria and three states with broader definitions eligibility.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State continues to see a significant number of children referred for Part C services that do not meet the State's criteria for eligibility. Approximately, 66 percent of children referred to the Lead Agency are not eligible. Substantiated cases of abuse through the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) account for a significant portion of referrals of children but most referred to the Lead Agency for Part C services from the Arizona Department of Child Safety do not meet the State's definition of developmental delay in the absence of other eligible conditions. Stakeholders also pointed out that while many children that are diagnosed with Austism Spectrum Disorders, only about a third of them receive a diagnosis by age three. Stakeholders identified that some potential referral sources may be hesitant to refer a child to Part C until the diagnosis is confirmed which would limit the amount of time the child is in early intervention or possibly even referred directly to Part B at age 3.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must address the timeline from point of referral to initial IFSP meeting based on actual, not an average, number of days.

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

7 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	39.00%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	75.85%	88.61%	91.21%	95.34%	97.58%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1,050	1,576	97.58%	100%	98.41%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

501

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

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

This indicator represents data for all children and families with initial Individualized Family Service plan between April 1, 2019 and June 30, 2019.

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

The data reflect all children with IFSPs between April 1, 2019 through June 30, 2019. The data represent more than 25 percent of all children with IFSPs completed during the year. The data are considered statistically representative of the full population of children served throughout the entire year. Every Early Intervention Program (EIP) in the state participates in monitoring for this indicator, regardless of their monitoring cycle.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The data represent 1,576 individual children, all with initial Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs) completed from every EIP from April 1, 2019 through June 30, 2019. Data for children in the monitoring period are representative of state demographics, including those children that are served by both small and large EIPs as well as urban, suburban, and rural, and tribal populations. Although there are 37 local EIPs, one very small EIP did not have any IFSPs during the monitoring period.

Although the State did not meet the 100 percent compliance requirement, FFY 2018 data represent a continued improvement over last year's results. Additionally, during the FFY 2018 reporting period more EIPS achieved a higher level of compliance. A total of 94 percent, or 32 out of 34, of EIPs achieved 95 percent or higher compliance in providing timely services.

Most infants and toddlers referred for early intervention services had their IFSPs completed timely, within the 45-day time frame. A total of 1,050 of 1,576 children and families received their IFSPs on time with an additional 501 children that had a delay due to exceptional family circumstances. Only 25 children did not receive timely early intervention services. Noncompliant eligibility delays accounted for 12 of the 25 children that did not have timely IFSPs within the 45-Day Timeline. The list below accounts for the reasons for delay in eligibility and initial IFSPs:
• Team member reason accounts for seven delayed eligibility decisions and 17 delayed IFSPs;
• Service coordinator delays account for three delayed eligibility decisions and four delayed IFSPs;
• Delay in obtaining contact information for the parent from the Department of Child Safety reason accounts for one delayed eligibility decision and one delayed IFSP;
• Agency partner delay accounts for one delayed eligibility decisions and one delayed IFSP;
• Weather reason accounts for no delayed eligibility decisions and one delayed IFSP; and
• Other reasons reason accounts for no delayed eligibility decisions and one delayed IFSP.

The Lead Agency issues findings of noncompliance to programs that do not meet 100 percent compliance for timely services. The Lead Agency reviews corrective action plans and supports EIPs in effective and timely correction of noncompliance. All 25 instances of child-specific noncompliance were tracked by Lead Agency Staff to ensure correction and that, although late, the individual children's IFSP was developed consistent with the OSEP 09-02 memo on timely corrections. EIPs are required to submit file reviews to Lead Agency Staff to verify the program is performing at 100 percent for timely IFSPs. For all EIPs, the Lead Agency offers TA and tracking tools to EIPs to support with improvement on timely IFSPs. Additionally, the Lead Agency supports EIPs with developing their own training plans to support their providers.

This year, findings of noncompliance were issued to local EIPs. Findings of noncompliance were not issued to five programs with noncompliance as they no longer have contracts to provide early intervention services with the Lead Agency. As part of the new Team Based Early Intervention Services contracts effective July 1, 2019, performance based metrics for the 45-Day Timeline were embedded to enhance clarity and to improve the Lead Agency's ability to hold local EIPs accountable through contract action moving forward.

The Lead Agency issues findings of noncompliance to programs that do not meet 100 percent compliance for timely services. The Lead Agency reviews corrective action plans and supports EIPs in effective and timely correction of noncompliance. All 25 instances of child-specific noncompliance were tracked by Lead Agency Staff to ensure correction and that, although late, the individual children's IFSPs were developed consistent with the OSEP 09-02 memo on timely corrections. EIPs are required to submit file reviews to Lead Agency Staff to verify the program is performing at 100 percent for timely IFSPs. For all EIPs, the Lead Agency offers TA and tracking tools to EIPs to support with improvement on timely IFSPs. Additionally, the Lead Agency supports EIPs with developing their own training plans to support their providers.

This year, findings of noncompliance were issued to local EIPs. Findings of noncompliance were not issued to five programs with noncompliance as they no longer have contracts to provide early intervention services with the Lead Agency. The Lead Agency verified that all children receiving services from these five programs received their IFSP, although late. As part of the new Team Based Early Intervention Services contracts effective July 1, 2019, performance based metrics for the 45-Day Timeline were embedded to enhance clarity and to improve the Lead Agency's ability to hold local EIPs accountable through contract action moving forward.

The list below shows the number of programs grouped by compliance level for the 45-Day Timeline.
• 24 programs were at 100 percent compliance
• Nine programs were between 95-99 percent compliance
• No programs were between 90-94 percent compliance
• One program was between 80-89 percent compliance

As outlined in the OSEP 09-02 memo, the Lead Agency requires EIPs to submit documentation of child specific correction and subsequent data that reflect correction for each area of noncompliance for verification of the correction and subsequent implementation of the regulatory requirement for the entire program. The Lead Agency ensures the EIP is implementing the regulatory requirement through on-site visits, requesting documents and notes from the file submitted through mail or e-mail, and reviewing current data submitted in the statewide database. The Lead Agency ensures that noncompliance is corrected as soon as possible, and no later than one year from the identification of the noncompliance, by providing EIPs with support offered through its TA System.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
19	17	2	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Based on findings of noncompliance, EIPs were placed on a corrective action plan. EIP leaders were required to work across agency lines to submit root cause analysis and plans for addressing the causes of their noncompliance. The Lead Agency provided technical assistance and webinars on federal requirements for this indicator attended by all early intervention staff in an area with noncompliance. The Lead Agency requested periodic updates from EIPs on their progress with the corrective action plans. EIP leaders were required to conduct file reviews on currently open cases and submit the records, including service coordinator progress notes as well eligibility and IFSP documentation, to the Lead Agency for verification. Depending on the level and extent of the noncompliance, five to fifteen percent of the EIP's current caseload was reviewed by Lead Agency Staff to verify that the program was correctly implementing regulatory requirements. consistent with the OSEP 09-02 memo.

Nineteen findings of noncompliance were issued in FFY 2017. The Lead Agency verified the 19 EIPs with findings of noncompliance had both demonstrated correction of all instances of child-specific noncompliance and demonstrated that they were implementing the regulatory requirements at 100 percent. Most of the programs, 17 of the 19, were able to demonstrate timely correction of the noncompliance within one year. Two programs were able to subsequently demonstrate correction of noncompliance shortly after one year from the date the findings of noncompliance were issued.

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

EIPs were required to submit data to the Lead Agency to verify individual cases of noncompliance have been corrected. Lead Agency Staff reviewed data submitted by EIPs in the statewide database and information from child records, including service coordinator progress notes as well as eligibility and IFSP documentation, for all 59 individual cases to determine that each child's eligibility decision and IFSP occurred, although late, consistent with the OSEP 09-02 memo.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;

B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and

C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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

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

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

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	80.00%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	56.69%	79.37%	82.14%	93.44%	94.96%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday. (yes/no)

YES

If no, please explain.

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
924	979	94.96%	100%	94.38%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances
This number will be added to the "Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

0

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

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

The data reflect all children, statewide, potentially eligible for Part B and exiting from April 1, 2019 through June 30, 2019.

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

The data reflect all children, potentially eligible for Part B and exiting between April 1, 2019 through June 30, 2019. The data represent more than 25 percent of all children exiting during the year who are potentially eligible for Part B. The data are considered statistically representative of the full population of children served throughout the entire year. Every Early Intervention Program (EIP) in the state participates in monitoring for this indicator, regardless of their monitoring cycle.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The families of 1,515 children exited Part C between April 1, 2019 and June 30, 2019. Of those children, 1,129 were of transition age, between two years, three months and three years of age. Of those children that were of transition age, only 1,043 exited within 90 days of their third birthday and required to have a timely transition planning meeting. Of those 1,043 children, 64 children had their initial IFSP meeting within 90 days of age three. This leaves 979 children for whom there should have been an IFSP with documented transition steps and services at least 90 days before their third birthday.

The Lead Agency issues findings of noncompliance to local EIPs that do not meet 100 percent compliance for transition planning. The Lead Agency reviews corrective action plans and supports in effective and timely correction of noncompliance. All instances of child-specific noncompliance have been tracked by Lead Agency staff to ensure correction and that, although late, the individual children's transition meeting occurred, although late, or is no longer in Part C consistent with the OSEP 09-02 memo on timely corrections. For all EIPs, the Lead Agency offers TA and tracking tools to EIPs to support with improvement on transition activities. Additionally, the Lead Agency supports EIPs with developing their own training plans to support their providers.

Historically, the Lead Agency has cited EIP's as a whole, including a Team Based Early Intervention Services (TBEIS) contractor, Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD), and Arizona Schools for the Deaf and Blind for findings of noncompliance. This year the five districts within DDD have been reported separately in the total number of programs. When noncompliant, DDD has been cited separately from the contractor for noncompliance in order to better address the root causes and local contributing factors of noncompliance within the program. ASDB no longer provides service coordination and was not cited separately for noncompliance with transition activities as there were no instances of ASDB contributing to noncompliance with transition.

Findings of noncompliance were issued to local EIPs. Findings of noncompliance were not issued to eight programs with noncompliance as they no longer have contracts to provide early intervention services with the Lead Agency. The Lead Agency verified that the children receiving services from these four programs either received their services late or exited Part C. As part of the new TBEIS contracts effective July 1, 2019, performance based metrics on transition compliance were embedded to enhance clarity and to improve the Lead Agency's ability to hold local EIPs accountable through contract action moving forward.

The list below accounts for the performance the 35 TBEIS Contractors and five DDD districts within the state.
• 21 programs were at 100 percent compliance;
• Ten programs were between 90-99 percent compliance;

• Three programs were between 80-89 percent compliance;
• Three programs were between 70-79 percent compliance; and
• Three programs were below 69 percent compliance.

As outlined in the OSEP 09-02 memo, the Lead Agency requires EIPs to submit documentation of child specific correction and subsequent data that reflect correction for each area of noncompliance for verification of the correction and subsequent implementation of the regulatory requirement for the entire program. The Lead Agency ensures the EIP is implementing the regulatory requirement through on-site visits, requesting documents and notes from the file submitted through mail or e-mail, and reviewing current data submitted in the statewide database. The Lead Agency ensures that noncompliance is corrected as soon as possible, and no later than one year from the identification of the noncompliance, by providing EIPs with support offered through its TA System.

Most children of transition age received their transition planning meeting in a timely manner. A total of 924 of 979 transition plans were timely. Only 55 children did not receive timely, documented transition plans. The list below accounts for the reasons for delay in noncompliant transition plans:
• Service coordinator delays account for seven delayed transition planning meetings;
• Service coordinator did not document occurrence of transition planning meeting for 11 children;
• Timely meeting but transition steps not documented on IFSP account for five children; and
• Meeting held more than 9 months before child's third birthday account for 32.

Stakeholders and EIP leaders identified that the slippage in transition planning was primarily due to the timing of the monitoring period with the contract transition reducing local EIPs focus on monitoring staff to ensure timely transition activities. Some EIP leaders around the state were focused on off-boarding staff and closing business operations for early intervention programs as contracts ended on June 30, 2019 while other leaders were preparing to hire, on-board staff, and increase infrastructure for the new contracts awarded on July 1, 2019. Some therapists and service coordinators were changing from one agency to another during the transition resulting in temporary capacity issues to track timelines and provide all required transition activities.

The ICC Transition committee is supporting the Lead Agency by researching and exploring additional improvement strategies identify potential TA to EIP leaders on improving the quality of early childhood transitions and transition from Part C to Part B. Combining support from ICC Transition committee and TA from the Lead Agency to EIPs including TBEIS contractors and DDD will support with making more gains toward the State's target going forward.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
8	5	3	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Based on findings of noncompliance, EIPs were placed on a corrective action plan. EIP leaders were required to work across agency lines to submit root cause analysis and plans for addressing the causes of their noncompliance. The Lead Agency provided TA and webinars on federal requirements for this indicator attended by all early intervention staff in an area with noncompliance. The Lead Agency requested periodic updates from EIPs on their progress with the corrective action plans. EIP leaders were required to conduct file reviews on currently open cases and submit the records, including service coordinator progress notes as well as transition planning and IFSP documentation, to the Lead Agency for verification. Lead Agency staff reviewed current data from the and information from the file reviews to verify the EIPs were implementing regulatory requirements at 100 percent consistent with the OSEP 09-02 memo. Depending on the level and extent of the noncompliance, five to fifteen percent of the EIP's current caseload was reviewed by Lead Agency staff to verify that the program was correctly implementing regulatory requirements.

Eight findings of noncompliance were issued in FFY 2017. The Lead Agency verified the eight EIPs with findings of noncompliance had both demonstrated correction of all instances of child-specific noncompliance and demonstrated that they were implementing the regulatory requirements at 100 percent. Most of the programs, five of the eight, were able to demonstrate timely correction of the noncompliance within one year. Three programs were able to subsequently demonstrate correction of noncompliance shortly after one year from the date the findings of noncompliance were issued.

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

EIPs were required to submit data to the Lead Agency to verify the 20 individual cases of noncompliance have been corrected. Lead Agency Staff reviewed data submitted by EIPs in the statewide database and information from child records, including service coordinator progress notes as well as transition planning and IFSP documentation, to verify the EIPs corrected all individual cases of noncompliance consistent with the OSEP 09-02 memo. Of the 20 individual cases, transition plans eventually occurred for 11 children, although late, and 9 children were exited from Part C before transition planning occurred.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

8A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8A - OSEP Response

8A - Required Actions

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;

B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and

C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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

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

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

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8B - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	89.00%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	69.57%	86.31%	83.47%	72.41%	81.65%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

YES

If no, please explain.

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
868	1,053	81.65%	100%	86.45%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of parents who opted out

This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.

49

Describe the method used to collect these data

Local EIPs enter data regarding notifications to the LEA in the state database. The Lead Agency and local EIPs manually record the SEA notification, depending on the age of the child at eligibility. Lead Agency staff cross-check the manual SEA notifications by local EIP's against the state database and reports by the SEA. Lead Agency staff verify data with file reviews from local EIPs.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, is the policy on file with the Department? (yes/no)

YES

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

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

The data reflect all children, statewide, potentially eligible for Part B and exiting from April 1, 2019 through June 30, 2019.

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

The data reflect all children, potentially eligible for Part B and exiting between April 1, 2019 through June 30, 2019. The data represent more than 25 percent of all children exiting during the year who are potentially eligible for Part B. The data are considered statistically representative of the full population of children served throughout the entire year. Every Early Intervention Program (EIP) in the state participates in monitoring for this indicator, regardless of their monitoring cycle.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The families of 1,515 children exited Part C between April 1, 2019 and June 30, 2019. Of those children, 1,129 were of transition age, between two years, three months and three years of age. Of those children that were of transition age, only 1,077 were made eligible within 90 days of their third birthday and required to have a timely referral to the SEA and LEA. Of those 1,077 children, 24 children had their Part C eligibility determined within 90 days of age three. This leaves 1,053 children for whom there should have been a referral to the SEA and LEA at least 90 days before their third birthday.

Although the State did not meet the 100 percent compliance requirement, FFY 2018 data represent significant improvement over last year's results. The Lead Agency issues findings of noncompliance to local EIPs that do not meet 100 percent compliance for SEA and LEA notifications. The Lead Agency reviews corrective action plans and supports in effective and timely correction of noncompliance. All instances of child-specific noncompliance have been tracked by Lead Agency staff to ensure correction and that, although late, the individual children's transition meeting occurred, although late, or is no longer in Part C consistent with the OSEP 09-02 memo on timely corrections. For all EIPs, the Lead Agency offers TA and tracking tools to EIPs to support with improvement on transition activities. Additionally, the Lead Agency supports EIPs with developing their own training plans to support their providers.

Historically, the Lead Agency has cited EIP's as a whole, including a Team Based Early Intervention Services (TBEIS) contractor, Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD), and Arizona Schools for the Deaf and Blind for findings of noncompliance. This year the five districts within DDD have been reported separately in the total number of programs. When noncompliant, DDD has been cited separately from the contractor for noncompliance in order to better address the root causes and local contributing factors of noncompliance within the program. ASDB no longer provides service coordination and was not cited separately for noncompliance with transition activities as there were no instances of ASDB contributing to noncompliance with transition.

This year, findings of noncompliance were issued to local EIPs. Findings of noncompliance were not issued to 12 programs with noncompliance as they

no longer have contracts to provide early intervention services with the Lead Agency. The Lead Agency verified that the children receiving services from these twelve programs either had a notification to the SEA and LEA, although late, or exited Part C. As part of the new TBEIS contracts effective July 1, 2019, performance based metrics on transition compliance were embedded to enhance clarity and to improve the Lead Agency's ability to hold local EIPs accountable through contract action moving forward.

The list below accounts for the performance the 35 TBEIS Contractors and five DDD districts within the state.
• Five programs were at 100 percent compliance;
• 14 programs were between 90-99 percent compliance;
• Seven programs were between 80-89 percent compliance;
• Four programs were between 70-79 percent compliance; and
• Ten programs were below 69 percent compliance.

Most children of transition age had a notification to both the SEA and LEA in a timely manner. A total of 867 of 1,053 notifications were timely with an additional 49 families opting out of notification to both the SEA and LEA. Only 137 children did not receive timely notification to the SEA and LEA. The list below accounts for the reasons for delay in noncompliant referrals to the SEA and LEA.
• Timely notification to LEA but delayed data entry resulting in late notification to SEA account for 98 delayed notifications; and
• Service coordinator delay accounts for 38 delayed notifications.

The Lead Agency collaborated with stakeholders including Part B, local EIPs, and parents to improve referrals to the SEA and LEA in order to capture compliance information on complex situations such as when a family moves to a new school district during their transition period or opts-out but then later changes their mind. In December 2018, the Lead Agency made some data system enhancements to capture more information around referrals to the SEA and LEA which allowed increased communication to local EIPs around the automatic notifications to the SEA. While it helped significantly, local EIPs felt more frequent communication would be better so another enhancement was made to the data system in November 2019 to ensure communication to the EIP occurs the same day regarding the automatic notification to the SEA.

The Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy Center) has been providing intensive TA during monthly phone calls to the Lead Agency and SEA around data linking. As a direct result of the support from DaSy Center, the Lead Agency and SEA are collaborating on an initiative for strategic linking of Part C and Part B data through infrastructure improvement. Specifically, arranging a technical agreement between the Lead Agency and SEA to provide consistent data for children enrolled in Part C and potentially eligible for Part B. Linking the data will support both the Lead Agency and SEA with ensuring compliance with federal indicators around transition as well as address critical questions compiled by DaSy Center about early intervention and early childhood special education for informing program operations, program improvement, policy, and accountability.

Additionally, the ICC Transition committee is supporting the Lead Agency by researching and exploring additional improvement strategies identify potential TA to EIP leaders on improving the quality of early childhood transitions and transition from Part C to Part B. Combining support from ICC Transition committee and TA from the Lead Agency to EIPs including TBEIS contractors and DDD will support with making more gains toward the State's target going forward.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
10	7	3	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Based on findings of noncompliance, EIPs were placed on a corrective action plan. EIP leaders were required to work across agency lines to submit root cause analysis and plans for addressing the causes of their noncompliance. The Lead Agency provided TA and webinars on federal requirements for this indicator attended by all early intervention staff in an area with noncompliance. The Lead Agency requested periodic updates from EIPs on their progress with the corrective action plans. EIP leaders were required to conduct file reviews on currently open cases and submit the records, including service coordinator progress notes, PEA referral documentation, faxes, and e-mails, to the Lead Agency for verification. Lead Agency staff reviewed current data from the and information from the file reviews to verify the EIPs were implementing regulatory requirements at 100 percent consistent with the OSEP 09-02 memo. Depending on the level and extent of the noncompliance, five to fifteen percent of the EIP's current caseload was reviewed by Lead Agency staff to verify that the program was correctly implementing regulatory requirements.

Ten findings of noncompliance were issued in FFY 2017. The Lead Agency verified all ten EIPs with findings of noncompliance had both demonstrated correction of all instances of child-specific noncompliance and demonstrated that they were implementing the regulatory requirements at 100 percent. Most of the programs, seven of the ten, were able to demonstrate timely correction of the noncompliance within one year. Three programs were able to subsequently demonstrate correction of noncompliance shortly after one year from the date the findings of noncompliance were issued.

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

EIPs were required to submit data to the Lead Agency to verify the 80 individual cases of noncompliance have been corrected. Lead Agency Staff reviewed data submitted by EIPs in the statewide database and information from child records, including service coordinator progress notes, PEA referral documentation, faxes, and e-mails, to verify the EIPs corrected all individual cases of noncompliance consistent with the OSEP 09-02 memo. Of the 80 individual cases, referrals to Part B eventually occurred, although late, for 57 children, one family opted-out, and 22 children were exited from Part C before a notification to Part B occurred.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

8B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8B - OSEP Response

8B - Required Actions

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;

B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and

C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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

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

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

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8C - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	57.00%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	70.34%	80.85%	77.52%	88.81%	90.24%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services (yes/no)

YES

If no, please explain.

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
744	979	90.24%	100%	93.23%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference

This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.

78

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

96

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

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

The data reflect all children, statewide, potentially eligible for Part B and exiting from April 1, 2019 through June 30, 2019.

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

The data reflect all children, potentially eligible for Part B and exiting between April 1, 2019 through June 30, 2019. The data represent more than 25 percent of all children exiting during the year who are potentially eligible for Part B. The data are considered statistically representative of the full population of children served throughout the entire year. Every Early Intervention Program (EIP) in the state participates in monitoring for this indicator, regardless of their monitoring cycle.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The families of 1,515 children exited Part C between April 1, 2019 and June 30, 2019. Of those children, 1,129 were of transition age, between two years, three months and three years of age. Of those children that were of transition age, only 1,043 exited within 90 days of their third birthday and required to have a timely transition conference. Of those 1,043 children, 64 children had their initial IFSP meeting within 90 days of age three. This leaves 979 children for whom there should have been a transition conference at least 90 days before their third birthday.

Although the State did not meet the 100 percent compliance requirement, FFY 2018 data represent significant improvement over last year's results. The Lead Agency issues findings of noncompliance to local EIPs that do not meet 100 percent compliance for transition planning. The Lead Agency reviews corrective action plans and supports in effective and timely correction of noncompliance. All instances of child-specific noncompliance have been tracked by Lead Agency staff to ensure correction and that the individual children's transition meeting occurred, although late, or the child is no longer in Part C consistent with the OSEP 09-02 memo on timely corrections. For all EIPs, the Lead Agency offers TA and tracking tools to EIPs to support with improvement on transition activities. Additionally, the Lead Agency supports EIPs with developing their own training plans to support their providers.

Historically, the Lead Agency has cited EIP's as a whole, including a Team Based Early Intervention Services (TBEIS) contractor, Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD), and Arizona Schools for the Deaf and Blind for findings of noncompliance. This year the five districts within DDD have been reported separately in the total number of programs. When noncompliant, DDD has been cited separately from the contractor for noncompliance in order to better address the root causes and local contributing factors of noncompliance within the program. ASDB no longer provides service coordination and was not cited separately for noncompliance with transition activities as there were no instances of ASDB contributing to noncompliance with transition.

This year, findings of noncompliance were issued to local EIPs. Findings of noncompliance were not issued to nine programs with noncompliance as they no longer have contracts to provide early intervention services with the Lead Agency. The Lead Agency verified that the children receiving services from these nine programs either received their transition conference late or exited Part C. As part of the new TBEIS contracts effective July 1, 2019,

performance based metrics on transition compliance were embedded to enhance clarity and to improve the Lead Agency's ability to hold local EIPs accountable through contract action moving forward.

The list below accounts for the performance the 35 TBEIS Contractors and five DDD districts within the state.
• 16 programs were at 100 percent compliance;
• 15 programs were between 90-99 percent compliance;
• Four programs were between 80-89 percent compliance;
• Three programs were between 70-79 percent compliance; and
• Two programs were below 70 percent compliance.

Most children of transition age received their transition conference in a timely manner. A total of 744 of 979 transition conferences occurred timely with an additional 96 transition conferences delayed due to exceptional family circumstances. Only 61 children did not receive a timely transition conference.The list below accounts for the reasons for delay in noncompliant transition conferences.
• Service Coordinator delay accounts for 47 delayed transition conferences; and
• Service coordinator did not document meeting occurring in 14 instances.

In order to address the reasons for delay and increase the quality of early childhood transitions, the ICC Transition committee is supporting the Lead Agency by researching and exploring additional improvement strategies identify potential TA to EIP leaders on improving the quality of early childhood transitions and transition from Part C to Part B. Combining support from ICC Transition committee and TA from the Lead Agency to EIPs including TBEIS contractors and DDD will support with making more gains toward the State's target going forward.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
10	7	3	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Based on findings of noncompliance, EIPs were placed on a corrective action plan. EIP leaders were required to work across agency lines to submit root cause analysis and plans for addressing the causes of their noncompliance. The Lead Agency provided TA and webinars on federal requirements for this indicator attended by all early intervention staff in an area with noncompliance. The Lead Agency requested periodic updates from EIPs on their progress with the corrective action plans. EIP leaders were required to conduct file reviews on currently open cases and submit the records, including service coordinator progress notes as well as transition conference and IFSP documentation, to the Lead Agency for verification. Lead Agency staff reviewed current data and information from the file reviews to verify the EIPs were implementing regulatory requirements at 100 percent consistent with the OSEP 09-02 memo. Depending on the level and extent of the noncompliance, five to fifteen percent of the EIP's current caseload was reviewed by Lead Agency staff to verify that the program was correctly implementing regulatory requirements.

Ten findings of noncompliance were issued in FFY 2017. The Lead Agency verified all ten EIPs with findings of noncompliance had both demonstrated correction of all instances of child-specific noncompliance and demonstrated that they were implementing the regulatory requirements at 100 percent. Most of the programs, seven of the ten, were able to demonstrate timely correction of the noncompliance within one year. Three programs were able to subsequently demonstrate correction of noncompliance shortly after one year from the date the findings of noncompliance were issued.

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

EIPs were required to submit data to the Lead Agency to verify the 32 individual cases of noncompliance have been corrected. Lead Agency Staff reviewed data submitted by EIPs in the statewide database and information from child records, including service coordinator progress notes as well as transition conference and IFSP documentation, to verify the EIPs corrected all individual cases of noncompliance consistent with the OSEP 09-02 memo. Of the 32 individual cases, transition conferences eventually occurred, although late, for 22 children, one family declined a transition conference, and 9 children were exited from Part C before a transition conference occurred.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

8C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8C - OSEP Response

8C - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (*EMAPS*)).

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

This indicator is not applicable to a State that has adopted Part C due process procedures under section 639 of the IDEA.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NA

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

This indicator is not applicable to a State that has adopted Part C due process procedures under section 639 of the IDEA. Arizona has adopted Part C due process procedures.

Select yes to use target ranges.

NA

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NA

Provide an explanation below.

NA

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	NA
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	NA

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

NA

Historical Data

Baseline	NA	NA			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target>=	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Data	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=	NA	NA

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Targets

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

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

NA

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

NA

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (*EMAPS*)).

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

10 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Provide an explanation below

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Historical Data

Baseline	2005				
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target>=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0				N/A	N/A

Targets

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

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. The Lead Agency had no mediation requests during FFY 2018, therefore no targets are required.

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role

Designated Lead Agency Director

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

Name:

Jenee Sisnroy

Title:

Part C Coordinator

Email:

jsisnroy@azdes.gov

Phone:

602-532-9960

Submitted on:

01/31/20 2:50:54 PM

Arizona Part C FFY 2018 SPP/APR

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Analysis of Representativeness and response rate by various categories including race, ethnicity, and county.

Representativeness of Race	Number of Families that Received the Survey	Number of Families that Responded to the Survey	Response Rate	Target Representation	Actual Representation	Difference	Representative Data
African American or Black	279	52	19%	5%	6%	1%	Yes
American Indian or Alaskan Native	303	55	18%	5%	6%	1%	Yes
Asian	131	18	14%	2%	2%	0%	Yes
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	16	1	6%	0%	0%	0%	Yes
White	4725	769	16%	83%	85%	2%	Yes
More Than One Race	259	13	5%	5%	1%	-3%	No
Total	**5713**	**908**	**16%**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**No**

Representativeness of Ethnicity	Number of Families that Received the Survey	Number of Families that Responded to the Survey	Response Rate	Target Representation	Actual Representation	Difference	Representative Data
Hispanic	2153	351	16%	38%	39%	1%	Yes
Not Hispanic	3560	557	16%	62%	61%	-1%	Yes
Total	**5713**	**908**	**16%**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**Yes**

Representativeness of County	Number of Families that Received the Survey	Number of Families that Responded to the Survey	Response Rate	Target Representation	Actual Representation	Difference	Representative Data
Apache	46	11	24%	1%	1%	0%	Yes
Cochise	104	13	13%	2%	1%	0%	Yes
Coconino	95	4	4%	2%	<1%	-1%	No
Gila	36	1	3%	1%	<1%	-1%	No

Represen-tativeness of County	Number of Families that Received the Survey	Number of Families that Responded to the Survey	Response Rate	Target Represen-tation	Actual Represen-tation	Difference	Represen-tative Data
Graham	38	18	47%	1%	2%	1%	No
Greenlee	7	3	43%	<1%	<1%	0%	Yes
La Paz	12	1	8%	<1%	<1%	0%	Yes
Maricopa	3748	699	19%	66%	77%	11%	No
Mohave	109	8	7%	2%	1%	-1%	No
Navajo	121	9	7%	2%	1%	-1%	No
Pima	646	52	8%	11%	6%	-6%	No
Pinal	463	20	4%	8%	2%	-6%	No
Santa Cruz	17	1	6%	<1%	<1%	0%	Yes
Yavapai	145	33	23%	3%	4%	1%	Yes
Yuma	126	31	25%	2%	3%	1%	Yes
Blank	0	4	N/A	0%	<1%	0%	No
Total	**5713**	**908**	**16%**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**No**

Accessibility Report

Filename: Arizona Part C FFY 2018 Indicator 4 Attachment 1.pdf

Report created by: Annie Converse, Data Manager, KConverse@azdes.gov
Organization: Arizona Department of Economic Security, Arizona Early Intervention Program

[Personal and organization information from the Preferences > Identity dialog.]

Summary

The checker found no problems in this document.

- Needs manual check: 0
- Passed manually: 2
- Failed manually: 0
- Skipped: 0
- Passed: 30
- Failed: 0

Detailed Report

Document

Rule Name	Status	Description
Accessibility permission flag	Passed	Accessibility permission flag must be set
Image-only PDF	Passed	Document is not image-only PDF
Tagged PDF	Passed	Document is tagged PDF
Logical Reading Order	Passed manually	Document structure provides a logical reading order
Primary language	Passed	Text language is specified
Title	Passed	Document title is showing in title bar
Bookmarks	Passed	Bookmarks are present in large documents
Color contrast	Passed manually	Document has appropriate color contrast

Page Content

Rule Name	Status	Description
Tagged content	Passed	All page content is tagged
Tagged annotations	Passed	All annotations are tagged
Tab order	Passed	Tab order is consistent with structure order
Character encoding	Passed	Reliable character encoding is provided
Tagged multimedia	Passed	All multimedia objects are tagged
Screen flicker	Passed	Page will not cause screen flicker
Scripts	Passed	No inaccessible scripts
Timed responses	Passed	Page does not require timed responses
Navigation links	Passed	Navigation links are not repetitive

Forms

Rule Name	Status	Description
Tagged form fields	Passed	All form fields are tagged
Field descriptions	Passed	All form fields have description

Alternate Text

Rule Name	Status	Description
Figures alternate text	Passed	Figures require alternate text
Nested alternate text	Passed	Alternate text that will never be read
Associated with content	Passed	Alternate text must be associated with some content
Hides annotation	Passed	Alternate text should not hide annotation
Other elements alternate text	Passed	Other elements that require alternate text

Tables

Rule Name	Status	Description
Rows	Passed	TR must be a child of Table, THead, TBody, or TFoot
TH and TD	Passed	TH and TD must be children of TR
Headers	Passed	Tables should have headers
Regularity	Passed	Tables must contain the same number of columns in each row and rows in each column
Summary	Passed	Tables must have a summary

Lists

Rule Name	Status	Description
List items	Passed	LI must be a child of L
Lbl and LBody	Passed	Lbl and LBody must be children of LI

Headings

Rule Name	Status	Description
Appropriate nesting	Passed	Appropriate nesting

ANNUAL REPORT CERTIFICATION OF THE INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COUNCIL UNDER PART C OF THE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT (IDEA)

Under IDEA Section 641(e)(1)(D) and 34 C.F.R. §303.604(c), the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) of each jurisdiction that receives funds under Part C of the IDEA must prepare and submit to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education (Department) and to the Governor of its jurisdiction an annual report on the status of the early intervention programs for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families operated within the State. The ICC may either: (1) prepare and submit its own annual report to the Department and the Governor, or (2) provide this certification with the State lead agency's State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR)[1] under Part C of the IDEA. This certification (including the SPP/APR) is due no later than February 3, 2020.

On behalf of the ICC of the State/jurisdiction of Arizona, I hereby certify that the ICC is: [please check one]

1. [ ] Submitting its own annual report (which is attached); or
2. [X] Using the State's Part C SPP/APR for FFY 2018 in lieu of submitting the ICC's own annual report. By completing this certification, the ICC confirms that it has reviewed the State's Part C SPP/APR for accuracy and completeness.[2]

I hereby further confirm that a copy of this Annual Report Certification and the annual report or SPP/APR has been provided to our Governor.

Signature of ICC Chairperson

Date 1/17/2020

Address or e-mail

anagraber@dynamitetherapy.com

Daytime telephone number

(844) 330-8600

1 Under IDEA Sections 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(II) and 642 and under 34 C.F.R. §80.40, the lead agency's SPP/APR must report on the State's performance under its SPP/APR and contain information about the activities and accomplishments of the grant period for a particular Federal fiscal year (FFY).

2 If the ICC is using the State's Part C SPP/APR and it disagrees with data or other information presented in the State's Part C SPP/APR, the ICC must attach to this certification an explanation of the ICC's disagreement and submit the certification and explanation no later than February 3, 2020.

Accessibility Report

Filename: ICC Certification Arizona Part C FFY 2018-2019 SPP APR.pdf

Report created by: Annie Converse, Data Manager, KConverse@azdes.gov
Organization: Arizona Department of Economic Security, Arizona Early Intervention Program

[Personal and organization information from the Preferences > Identity dialog.]

Summary

The checker found no problems in this document.

- Needs manual check: 0
- Passed manually: 2
- Failed manually: 0
- Skipped: 0
- Passed: 30
- Failed: 0

Detailed Report

Document

Rule Name	Status	Description
Accessibility permission flag	Passed	Accessibility permission flag must be set
Image-only PDF	Passed	Document is not image-only PDF
Tagged PDF	Passed	Document is tagged PDF
Logical Reading Order	Passed manually	Document structure provides a logical reading order
Primary language	Passed	Text language is specified
Title	Passed	Document title is showing in title bar
Bookmarks	Passed	Bookmarks are present in large documents
Color contrast	Passed manually	Document has appropriate color contrast

Page Content

Rule Name	Status	Description
Tagged content	Passed	All page content is tagged
Tagged annotations	Passed	All annotations are tagged
Tab order	Passed	Tab order is consistent with structure order
Character encoding	Passed	Reliable character encoding is provided
Tagged multimedia	Passed	All multimedia objects are tagged
Screen flicker	Passed	Page will not cause screen flicker
Scripts	Passed	No inaccessible scripts
Timed responses	Passed	Page does not require timed responses
Navigation links	Passed	Navigation links are not repetitive

Forms

Rule Name	Status	Description
Tagged form fields	Passed	All form fields are tagged
Field descriptions	Passed	All form fields have description

Alternate Text

Rule Name	Status	Description
Figures alternate text	Passed	Figures require alternate text
Nested alternate text	Passed	Alternate text that will never be read
Associated with content	Passed	Alternate text must be associated with some content
Hides annotation	Passed	Alternate text should not hide annotation
Other elements alternate text	Passed	Other elements that require alternate text

Tables

Rule Name	Status	Description
Rows	Passed	TR must be a child of Table, THead, TBody, or TFoot
TH and TD	Passed	TH and TD must be children of TR
Headers	Passed	Tables should have headers
Regularity	Passed	Tables must contain the same number of columns in each row and rows in each column
Summary	Passed	Tables must have a summary

Lists

Rule Name	Status	Description
List items	Passed	LI must be a child of L
Lbl and LBody	Passed	Lbl and LBody must be children of LI

Headings

Rule Name	Status	Description
Appropriate nesting	Passed	Appropriate nesting