ID
Part C

FFY2014
State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

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

Executive Summary:

FFY 2014 proved to be a good year with consistently high Annual Performance Report data reporting. Additionally, Idaho has been working very hard on developing an implementation plan for Phase II of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). We've received excellent technical assistance regarding the SSIP from multiple partners including but not limited to ECTA, DaSy, NCSI, etc.

In FFY 2014, Idaho revised the Family Survey process and identified a new survey tool to gather data for indicator #4. Please refer to indicator #4 for further details.

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.

The Infant Toddler Program has established and will use proper methods of administering the General Supervision System within the state.

Overview of Monitoring System

The Infant Toddler Program has specific quality indicators and compliance measures to determine regional performance of regulatory requirements and other standards identified by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) and the state.

- Lead Agency monitors data reflecting these standards and indicators on a regular basis.
- Many indicators are monitored on a regular basis by hub/regional supervisors and staff.
- Summary reports are routinely provided to Early Childhood Coordinating Council and other interest groups.
- Monitoring data is used to inform discussions and policy decisions.
- State web-based data system and the ECO Family Outcomes Survey-Revised (FOS-R) is closely aligned with compliance and performance indicators.
- Idaho's general supervision system employs self-assessments by regional programs.
- Technical assistance (TA) is used to ensure correction of non-compliance and improved performance.

Advisory Council

Monitoring of agencies, institutions, organizations, and activities used by the state to implement Part C is completed by the Department with the advice and assistance of the Early Childhood Coordinating Council, Infant Toddler Program Committee, and the Regional Early Childhood Committees.

Data System and Verification

Idaho Infant Toddler Program's electronic data collection and management system is a web-based system that contains all collected child enrollment, demographic, caregiver, service coordination provision, eligibility categories, and service categories. The web-based data system has undergone extensive revisions to allow for improved capacity for data collection, analysis, report generation, and billing capabilities. The data system provides real-time data to both regional and Central Office personnel. Data in the web-based system is used to:

- Report 618 data to OSEP;
- Respond to many compliance and performance indicators in each program's self-assessment; and
- Determine compliance and performance status for SPP/APR indicators.

Data from the web-based data system populates relevant local program compliance and performance indicators included in the Regional Annual Performance Report (RAPR) document. Reports are generated in Central Office and data is transferred to the RAPR document. The Lead Agency verifies the web-based data entry for accuracy, reliability, non-duplication, etc. at regular intervals using Crystal Report software and on an annual basis for the APR and RAPR.

Family Survey

Idaho Infant Toddler Program recently switched to utilizing results from the ECO Family Outcomes Survey-Revised as part of the identification of issues and areas for improvement.

Desk Audit

Lead Agency conducts desk audit process using data compiled through the web-based system to accomplish the following:

- Ensure data in the web-based system is accurate.
- Identify potential areas of non-compliance and areas for improvement.
- Conduct inquiry to obtain additional information as needed.
- Issue findings of non-compliance if necessary.
- Monitor implementation of corrective action plans.
- Provide technical assistance.
- Assure correction of non-compliance in accordance with federal requirement.

Self-Assessment

A regional assessment is completed by local programs annually utilizing a standardized tool titled the Regional Annual Performance Report (RAPR). Self-assessment indicators developed by the state (focusing on both compliance and quality) are aligned with the SPP/APR and the state's web-based data system. The Lead Agency populates relevant self-assessment indicators with data from the web-based data system, ECO Family Outcomes Survey-Revised results, and child outcome data, and sends to programs to complete other elements from targeted file reviews, regional complaint logs, and other sources of information. Programs are required to use other data sources when completing the self-assessment and determining performance in meeting targets (e.g., record review, family survey, previous monitoring reports, Interagency Agreements, etc.) The Lead Agency verifies program self-assessment data through desk audit procedures such as comparison of data reports from multiple data sources (e.g., file review and web-based data system reports). The Lead Agency will provide TA to programs in developing a negotiated action plan, which identifies concrete steps/timelines to remediate system challenges, areas of concern or desired growth, and

areas of non-compliance as appropriate (e.g., regional Corrective Action Plans). Regional programs include baseline data and measurable, time-specific objectives and performance targets, as well as TA and training needs in corrective action and enhancement plans, as strategies to help achieve the targeted objectives. In implementing corrective action and enhancement plans, the hub/regional leadership team is responsible for:

- Ensuring the plan is implemented as developed.
- Documenting that the activities listed are occurring within the given timelines identified in the plan.
- Reviewing progress quarterly and making adjustments in the plan and the activities as warranted. On compliance issues, performance data and status of record review findings are reported in the Corrective Action Plan (CAP) document.
- Requesting specific technical assistance from Central Office to implement the plan and resolve system challenges and any identified areas of non-compliance.
- Advising Central Office of barriers to implementation (and possible solutions) that are not controlled at the regional level.

For regional programs that identify non-compliance, the Lead Agency will complete quarterly corrective action plan monitoring calls to assess status and progress. In instances where no progress toward expected targets is made over a period of more than two quarters, monthly monitoring, increased technical assistance, further troubleshooting, or other sanctions may result.

Technical Assistance for Monitoring

The Lead Agency provides TA to regional programs on the web-based data system and in the development and implementation of CAPs and enhancement plans. The Lead Agency can require specific TA if non-compliance and improvements are not being addressed in a timely manner. Hub/regional leadership teams access TA from in-state and national experts as needed to ensure correction of non-compliance, improve performance in meeting targets, and enhance quality practices to improve outcomes for children and their families.

Analysis of Complaints and/or Due Process Resolutions for Monitoring and TA Purposes
All families are provided with information on complaint and dispute resolution processes, including the availability of mediation. Formal and informal complaints are managed by the Lead Agency where a log of complaints and resolutions is maintained. When a complaint is initiated by a family, whether verbally or in writing, they are informed about the procedural safeguards and advised how to submit a complaint in writing, should they choose to do so. Families are also informed about mediation and encouraged to consider it as one option to help resolve a dispute. Should a family choose to request mediation or due process, Lead Agency contacts appropriate mediators/hearing officers, confirms arrangements, and facilitates connection between the family and the mediator/hearing officer.

The Lead Agency investigates administrative complaints when filed. Lead Agency aggregates data/results from formal/informal complaints and due process hearings to identify or emphasize areas that need attention during focused monitoring visits or on improvement plans and for managing provider contracts.

When non-compliance or areas needing improvement are identified, CAPs and enhancement plans are written. The Lead Agency ensures correction of non-compliance as required. The Lead Agency ensures timeliness of completing findings/resolutions, and analyzes data to modify policies, procedures and practices.

Data Collection for SPP/APR

Idaho's web-based data system is aligned with SPP/APR indicators. The Regional Annual Performance Report document is completed annually by all regions, and findings are used in developing the SPP/APR. If available, information about Complaints and Due Process Hearings is aggregated and analyzed. The ECO

Family Outcomes Survey-Revised results and child outcomes data also inform SPP/APR. A focused monitoring system is also used in SPP/APR development.

Enforcement, Including Sanctions

The Infant Toddler Program enforces compliance and performance through the following:

- Reporting data to the public.
- Using results of program self-assessment and focused monitoring to identify non-compliance, target technical assistance, and support programs in developing meaningful and effective improvement plans.
- Reviewing the following with the Early Childhood Coordinating Council (previously the State Interagency Coordinating Council):
    - Systemic non-compliance or low performance and resulting corrective actions required. These may be identified through review of web-based data, program self-assessment, focused monitoring, complaints, and due process activities.

In instances where correction of non-compliance does not occur within 12 months of identification, the Lead Agency will take one or more of the following enforcement actions:

- Advise the region of available sources of technical assistance.
- Direct the use of regional program funds on areas in which the region needs assistance.
- Require the region to prepare a corrective action plan, an improvement plan, and/or to enter into a compliance agreement with the Lead Agency involving upper level administrators.
- In extreme instances, the Lead Agency may withhold Part C funds from the region.

Regional programs will impose the following hierarchy of monitoring and enforcement actions for contracted services:

- Monitoring of contracts at least every six months.
- Releasing payments only upon receipt of documentation of actual service provision.
- Denying or recouping payment for services for which non-compliance is documented.
- Halting all new referrals until deficiency is substantially remediated by the contractor.
- Amending the provider contract to shorten the term by revising the ending date.
- Termination or non-renewal of the provider contract.

After written notification of impending enforcement action, the Contractor has the opportunity to meet with Lead Agency staff to review the available data, explain what will be necessary to achieve compliance, and review the evidence of change that will be required to demonstrate sufficient improvement to reverse the enforcement action, if appropriate.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Technical Assistance System:

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

Idaho has the following mechanisms in place to ensure timely delivery of high-quality, evidence-based technical assistance and support to regional early intervention programs:

- Quarterly in-person meetings with hub leadership.
- Monthly hub leadership conference calls.
- Regional Annual Performance Report.
- Corrective Action Plans.
- Periodic TA calls with each region.
- Infant Toddler Program eManual.
- Policy Inquiry Tracking System.
- Infant Toddler Program Key Information Data System (ITPKIDS) web-based data system and Crystal Reports.
- Statewide evidence-based early intervention mentors.
- Monthly mentorship and reflective supervision with statewide mentors and multi-disciplinary teams.
- Monthly mentorship and reflective supervision with statewide mentors and Dathan Rush and M'Lisa Shelden.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

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

Idaho Code, Title 16, Chapter 1 assures a system of personnel development that provides:

- Interdisciplinary pre-service and in-service training.
- Training of a variety of personnel needed to meet the requirements of Part C policy.
- Training specific to: Implementing strategies for the recruitment and retention of early intervention service providers:
    - Meeting the interrelated social/emotional, health, developmental, and educational needs of eligible infants and toddlers.
    - Assisting the family in enhancing the development of their children, and in participating fully in the development and implementation of the Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP).
- Training personnel to work in rural and home-based settings.
- Training personnel to coordinate transitions.
- Training personnel in emotional and social development of young children.

The procedures and activities associated with training personnel to implement services for infants, toddlers and their families comprise a Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD). The CSPD Part C system includes the following criteria:

- Conducting annual update of the staffing and training needs assessment identifying statewide personnel development needs.
- Developing a statewide plan for addressing personnel development needs.
- Assuring in-service training delivered relates to the topics and competencies identified in needs assessments.
- Providing specialized orientation to newly hired or contracted professionals, as well as specialized continued education to long-term practitioners.
- Disseminating information regarding pre-service and in-service training courses, workshops, webinars, and conferences.

In-service training coordinated through the hub/regional Infant Toddler Program to public health and private providers, primary
referral sources, professionals, service coordinators, and parents regarding:

- Requirements for:
  - Child Find.
  - Multidisciplinary evaluation/assessment.
  - Individualized Family Service Plan/Service Coordination.
  - Procedural Safeguards.
- Understanding the basic components of the Idaho Early Intervention System.
- Meeting the interrelated social or emotional, health, developmental, and educational needs of Part C eligible children.
- Assisting families in enhancing their infants/toddlers development by fully participating in their Individualized Family Service Plan's development and implementation.

Ongoing training to Part C providers is offered in each hub/region. An online eManual has been provided for procedures on child find, evaluation and assessment, individualized family service plans and transition, and procedural safeguards. Training in these components is required for all providers and available, as needed. Online training modules support key principles in early intervention quality practices in service coordination and IFSPs.

Additionally, regional/hub supervisors regularly contact and train groups and individual primary referral sources to orient them to the Infant Toddler Program, and share information regarding the benefits of early intervention, risks and eligibility criteria, how to make referrals, and procedural requirements. Pediatric and medical groups, the Idaho Perinatal Project, parent organizations, child providers, Family and Children Services child protection workers, and WIC clinicians are examples of target audiences included in the program's outreach efforts.

Training efforts are coordinated with federal child care initiatives on inclusion and integration of the child with a disability in child care settings. Additional efforts will focus on expanding early intervention consultative services to childcare providers.

Parent education activities are facilitated by Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), Parent Training Information Center, and Regional Early Childhood Committees. Idaho Parents Unlimited, through their regional consultants, offers training annually on IFSP development, resource identification and coordination, parent rights, etc. Idaho Parents Unlimited also sponsors a semi-annual parent conference with a wide variety of sessions concerning parenting and disability issues.

Regular technical assistance and coordination meetings are held with the Infant Toddler Program regional/hub leaders. Additionally, the program manager arranges technical assistance visits to each region to assist with program coordination.

The Department of Health and Welfare and the Early Childhood Coordinating Council recognize the expertise of professional organizations for addressing pre-service and in-service training needs. National professional organizations and their Idaho chapters or affiliates assist in implementing the Part C Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD).

Idaho has a Consortium for the Preparation of Early Childhood Professionals made up of faculty from each institution of higher education, and representatives from various early childhood agencies and professional organizations. The Consortium facilitates coordination of university programs for the Early Childhood/Early Childhood Special Education Blended Certificate and articulation from two-year to four-year programs. The Consortium assists the Lead Agency in the review of transcripts to determine fully-qualified candidates and

to prepare academic plans for professions under conditional hiring agreements. Additionally, the Consortium partners with the Department of Health and Welfare to coordinate internship placements and to promote training in evidence-based practices in pre-service programs.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: ☐ apply this to all Part C results indicators

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

Idaho engaged in the following activities to obtain stakeholder input regarding the FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 SPP indicator targets:

- The Central Office Infant Toddler Program staff identified the need for stakeholder input regarding the new SPP indicator targets. Staff met to review the previous SPP indicator targets and actual data to identify a potential starting point for the new FFY 2013-2018 targets. Central Office staff presented the previous SPP indicator targets and actual data to identify a potential starting point for the new FFY 2013-2018 targets, along with the above observations, to the leadership team during a quarterly Hub Leadership meeting. During this meeting, current resources, the increase in enrollment, and the new SSIP requirements were discussed, as well as how to effectively maintain/improve the SPP Performance Indicators. Using the information from this discussion, draft targets were identified for each SPP indicator to take forward to the Infant Toddler Program Committee and the Early Childhood Coordinating Council.
    1. **Indicator #2** - Idaho has made steady progress during the previous Federal Fiscal Years to ensure services are being provided in a child's natural environment. Additionally, Idaho has strong policies and procedures in place and contract language has been developed to ensure continued progress.
    2. **Indicator #3** - Idaho has met few targets in the previous Federal Fiscal Year for this indicator. We believe the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) will have a positive long-term impact in this area.
    3. **Indicator #4** - Idaho has made steady progress in all family outcomes during the previous Federal Fiscal Years for this indicator. We believe the SSIP will have a positive impact. Idaho has revamped Family Survey Process to improve return rates and link Family Survey data to Child Outcomes data. New baseline and targets will be included in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR. Refer to Indicator #4 for additional information.
    4. **Indicators #5 and #6** - During the previous Federal Fiscal Years for these indicators, Idaho remained fairly steady, until the 2008 recession. As a result, the state put measures in place to increase the number of birth-to-one-year-olds and birth-to-three-year-olds being served, with great success. We anticipate making slow and steady progress but know this is a potential area of concern due to the program's resource capacity.
    5. **Indicator #9** - Not applicable for Idaho Part C.
    6. **Indicator #10** - Idaho has not received any mediation requests during the previous Federal Fiscal Years.
    7. **Indicator #11** - Idaho will submit the baseline and SPP targets when submitting Indicator #11 in April of 2016.

- The Early Childhood Coordinating Council's Infant Toddler Program Committee met to review and discuss the proposed targets identified during the Hub Leadership meeting. Committee members asked whether the SSIP would impact the current level of performance for any indicators. There may be some impact on performance, but we want to move forward and do our best to continue to make slow and steady progress. The Infant Toddler Program Committee accepted the newly proposed targets and recommended we present them to the full Early Childhood Coordinating Council for review and approval.
- The Infant Toddler Program Committee, along with the Part C Coordinator, presented information on previous targets and actual data, along with the FFY 2013 - 2018 SPP targets, to the Early Childhood Coordinating Council, with a rationale for how the new targets were identified. Council members fully approved the new targets, especially in light of the current resource capacity and additional work required to complete the SSIP to improve child outcome results.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

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

Idaho will post results on the performance of all seven regions and the state for the FFY 2014 SPP/APR on the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare Idaho Infant Toddler Program website no later than February 8, 2016 for any member of the public to access as we submit the FFY 2014 SPP/APR to OSEP. Additionally, the results will be reviewed and shared through other forums such as meetings of the hub and regional supervisors, program managers, and Early Childhood Coordinating Council.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 1: Timely provision of services

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		72.00%	81.40%	78.00%	84.30%	95.00%	93.40%	93.00%	91.80%	96.32%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
1995	2293	96.32%	100%	95.77%

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)	201

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

- State monitoring
- State database

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

Full FFY 2014 reporting year - July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015.

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

In Idaho, timely services are defined as the actual start date being equal to or less than the projected start date for any new service initiated in an IFSP. A statewide report encompassing all new services projected to start in FFY 2014 was generated from the ITPKIDS web-based data system.

Idaho has a number of methods to ensure the accuracy of timely service data. These methods include:

- Hub leaders running reports on a monthly basis to identify any missing or inaccurate data.
- Central Office running reports during the annual R-APR, SPP/APR, and Corrective Action Plan processes to identify missing or inaccurate data.
- ITPKIDS data system allowing only one Projected and Actual Start Date to be recorded for a service.
- Infant Toddler Program data analyst providing program managers and hub leaders with quarterly and annual summary reports on timeliness and identifying any data cleanup needs.
- Infant Toddler Program data analyst running reports on a quarterly basis that determine if Projected and Actual Start Dates have been incorrectly modified by end users in ITPKIDS.
- Infant Toddler Program data analyst and central office running reports quarterly and annually to analyze reasons for lateness and look for any anomalies that may indicate data entry errors or training needs around documentation.

Necessary modifications are made in ITPKIDS when inaccuracies are identified. Infant Toddler Program Central Office staff and data analyst work together to identify any state or local error patterns or trends. When patterns are identified, actions to rectify the issues include but are not limited to the following:

- Staff training using ITPKIDS through videos, a user guide, and supervisor-led trainings upon hire.
- Collection of qualitative information regarding the data via discussion of issues at quarterly hub leadership meetings for hub leaders to inform their local staff.
- In person, phone, or email communication with hub leaders identifying data areas to be addressed and actions needed.
- ITPKIDS business team discusses potential modifications to the system to prevent future issues.
- If necessary, modify ITPKIDS training videos and user guide. If necessary, change user access level for specified users.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In Idaho, exceptional family circumstances were included as timely when calculating the percentage of children receiving timely services.

Statewide, two hundred and one (201) children had delays in timely service delivery due to exceptional family/extenuating circumstances as defined by IDEA Part C. Examples of exceptional family circumstances include:
- Conflict with family scheduling appointment
- Child/family illness or hospitalization
- Family declined service
- Family no show
- Unable to contact family
- Family request for later service start date

Statwide, ninety-seven (97) children had a delay in timely services due to agency reasons. Examples of agency reasons include:
- High caseload/therapist unavailable
- Interpretation/translation issue
- Therapist ill
- Delay in evaluation

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings

Not applicable.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Idaho demonstrated that it corrected all findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, Idaho reports verification that both EIS programs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2013: (1) are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) have corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program.

For prong 1 correction, subsequent data (later than June 30, 2014) from ITPKIDS (Idaho's web-based data system) showed that all services were provided in a timely manner.

For prong 2 correction, data from ITPKIDS showed that the services identified in IFSPs were provided, although late, for all 85 children reported as delayed in FFY 13, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, the family declined services, or the EIS program was unable to make contact with the family.

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

Correction of each individual incidence of non-compliance is verified through ITPKIDS. ITPKIDS captures the Projected and Actual Start Dates for every new service initiated in an IFSP. If the Actual Start Date is later than the Projected Start Date, ITPKIDS requires users to record a delay reason before they can save the service record.

Central Office staff generate and review timely services reports using the data from ITPKIDS described above during the annual R-APR, SPP/APR, Corrective Action Plan process, and at other necessary intervals, to verify each individual instance of noncompliance is corrected unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, the family declined services, or the EIS program was unable to make contact with the family.

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			92.30%	92.50%	92.70%	92.90%	93.00%	94.00%	94.50%	95.00%
Data		92.50%	92.60%	93.10%	96.70%	99.00%	95.30%	96.20%	97.30%	98.52%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	95.30%	95.50%	95.70%	95.90%	96.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho engaged in the following activities to obtain stakeholder input regarding the FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 SPP indicator #2 targets:

- Central Office Infant Toddler Program staff reviewed the previous SPP indicator targets and actual data to identify a potential starting point for the new FFY 2013-2018 targets. The following observations were made:
  - **Indicator #2** - Idaho has made steady progress during the previous Federal Fiscal Years to ensure services are being provided in a child's natural environment. Additionally, Idaho has established strong policies, procedures, and contract language to ensure continued progress in this area.
- This information was then presented to the leadership team during a quarterly Hub Leadership meeting. During this meeting, current resources, the increase in enrollment, and the new SSIP requirements were discussed, as well as how to effectively maintain/improve the SPP Performance Indicators. Using the information from this discussion, draft targets were identified for each SPP indicator to take forward to the Infant Toddler Program Committee and the Early Childhood Coordinating Council.
- The Early Childhood Coordinating Council's Infant Toddler Program Committee met to review and discuss the proposed targets identified during the Hub Leadership meeting. Committee members asked whether the SSIP would impact the current level of performance for any indicators. There may be some impact on performance, but we want to move forward and do our best to continue to make slow and steady progress. The Infant Toddler Program Committee accepted the newly proposed targets and recommended we present them to the Early Childhood Coordinating Council for review and approval.
- The Infant Toddler Program Committee, along with the Part C Coordinator, presented information on previous targets and actual data along with the FFY 2013 - 2018 SPP targets to the Early Childhood Coordinating Council, with a rationale for how the new targets were identified. Council members fully

approved the new targets, especially in light of the current resource capacity and additional work required to complete the SSIP to improve child outcome results.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	1,787	
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	1,802	

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
1,787	1,802	98.52%	95.30%	99.17%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Not applicable.

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A1	2009	Target ≥						72.10%	64.80%	65.00%	65.20%	60.40%
		Data					71.60%	64.60%	61.40%	60.28%	59.80%	57.50%
A2	2009	Target ≥						56.40%	53.50%	53.70%	53.90%	55.50%
		Data					55.90%	53.30%	51.50%	54.16%	55.30%	53.15%
B1	2009	Target ≥						73.10%	67.30%	67.50%	67.70%	64.00%
		Data					72.60%	67.10%	62.30%	63.97%	65.00%	59.93%
B2	2009	Target ≥						53.50%	50.60%	50.80%	51.00%	50.20%
		Data					53.00%	50.40%	47.90%	50.00%	49.40%	48.85%
C1	2009	Target ≥						75.30%	70.40%	70.60%	70.80%	70.00%
		Data					74.80%	70.20%	67.60%	66.60%	66.90%	65.15%
C2	2009	Target ≥						62.10%	58.46%	58.60%	58.80%	58.00%
		Data					61.60%	58.20%	57.10%	58.30%	57.40%	56.25%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	60.60%	61.00%	61.50%	63.00%	65.00%
Target A2 ≥	55.70%	56.00%	56.50%	57.00%	
Target B1 ≥	64.20%	64.80%	65.20%	65.60%	67.20%
Target B2 ≥	50.40%	50.80%	51.20%	51.60%	52.00%
Target C1 ≥	70.20%	70.60%	71.00%	71.40%	71.80%
Target C2 ≥	58.20%	58.60%	59.00%	59.40%	59.80%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho engaged in the following activities to obtain stakeholder input regarding the FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 SPP indicator #3 targets:

- Central Office Infant Toddler Program staff reviewed the previous SPP indicator targets and actual data to identify a potential starting point for the new FFY 2013-2018 targets. The following observations were

made:

- **Indicator #3** - Idaho has not met many of the targets in the previous Federal Fiscal Year for this indicator. We believe the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) will have a positive long-term impact in this area, with small incremental improvements anticipated each year.

- Central Office staff presented the previous SPP indicator targets and actual data to identify a potential starting point for the new FFY 2013-2018 targets, along with the above observations, to the leadership team during a quarterly Hub Leadership meeting. During this meeting, current resources, the increase in enrollment, and the new SSIP requirements were discussed, as well as how to effectively maintain/improve the SPP Performance Indicators. Using the information from this discussion, draft targets were identified for each SPP indicator to take forward to the Infant Toddler Program Committee and the Early Childhood Coordinating Council.
- The Early Childhood Coordinating Council's Infant Toddler Program Committee met to review and discuss the proposed targets identified during the Hub Leadership meeting. Committee members asked whether the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) would impact the current level of performance for any indicators. There may be some impact on performance, but we want to move forward and do our best to continue to make slow and steady progress. The Infant Toddler Program Committee accepted the newly proposed targets and recommended we present them to the Early Childhood Coordinating Council for review and approval.
- The Infant Toddler Program Committee, along with the Part C Coordinator, presented information on previous targets and actual data along with the FFY 2013 - 2018 SPP targets to the Early Childhood Coordinating Council, with a rationale for how the new targets were identified. Council members fully approved the new targets, especially in light of the current resource capacity and additional work required to complete the SSIP to improve child outcome results.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	1190.00

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	6.00	0.50%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	353.00	29.66%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	167.00	14.03%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	331.00	27.82%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	333.00	27.98%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	498.00	857.00	57.50%	60.60%	58.11%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	664.00	1190.00	53.15%	55.70%	55.80%

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	7.00	0.59%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	385.00	32.35%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	232.00	19.50%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	383.00	32.18%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	183.00	15.38%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	615.00	1007.00	59.93%	64.20%	61.07%
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	566.00	1190.00	48.85%	50.40%	47.56%

Explanation of B2 Slippage

Idaho has encountered consistent challenges meeting the target for indicator 3B2. Like any other early intervention program, Idaho encounters regular turnover due to low wages, burnout, etc. In SFY 2014, the Developmental Specialist turnover rate was at an all-time high of 25%. The turnover rate puts a strain on our system to train and bring new staff/contractors up to speed to understand and accurately complete the entry and exit Early Childhood Outcomes process.

The State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) provides the opportunity for Idaho to focus on improving Early Childhood Outcomes results. Phase I of the SSIP allowed Idaho to identify strengths and areas of improvement in the Child Outcomes process. Making the Child Outcomes process more meaningful to staff/contractors and families has been a challenge for the state. The program has worked hard to make progress in this area, but there is still much that needs to be done.

Further analysis and surveying completed during Phase II provided valuable information regarding the activities/strategies Idaho will focus on to improve Child Outcome results. Based on the data and infrastructure analysis and staff/contractor surveys completed in Phase I, along with further analysis and surveying completed in Phase II, Idaho is confident Phase III will provide the opportunity to implement targeted activities/strategies while leveraging existing resources. Phase III should also allow Idaho to make the necessary modifications and improvements at the local and state levels to improve and meet the targets for this indicator.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of	Percentage of

	Children	Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	4.00	0.34%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	322.00	27.06%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	181.00	15.21%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	442.00	37.14%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	241.00	20.25%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	623.00	949.00	65.15%	70.20%	65.65%
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	683.00	1190.00	56.25%	58.20%	57.39%

Was sampling used? No

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	1190.00

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	6.00	0.50%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	353.00	29.66%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	167.00	14.03%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	331.00	27.82%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	333.00	27.98%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	498.00	857.00	57.50%	60.60%	58.11%	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 (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	664.00	1190.00	53.15%	55.70%	55.80%	Met Target	No Slippage

** FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.*

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	7.00	0.59%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	385.00	32.35%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	232.00	19.50%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	383.00	32.18%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	183.00	15.38%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	615.00	1007.00	59.93%	64.20%	61.07%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	566.00	1190.00	48.85%	50.40%	47.56%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

** FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.*

Explanation of B2 Slippage

Idaho has encountered consistent challenges meeting the target for indicator 3B2. Like any other early intervention program, Idaho encounters regular turnover due to low wages, burnout, etc. In SFY 2014, the Developmental Specialist turnover rate was at an all-time high of 25%. The turnover rate puts a strain on our system to train and bring new staff/contractors up to speed to understand and accurately complete the entry and exit Early Childhood Outcomes process.

The State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) provides the opportunity for Idaho to focus on improving Early Childhood Outcomes results. Phase I of the SSIP allowed Idaho to identify strengths and areas of improvement in the Child Outcomes process. Making the Child Outcomes process more meaningful to staff/contractors and families has been a challenge for the state. The program has worked hard to make progress in this area, but there is still much that needs to be done.

Further analysis and surveying completed during Phase II provided valuable information regarding the activities/strategies Idaho will focus on to improve Child Outcome results. Based on the data and infrastructure analysis and staff/contractor surveys completed in Phase I, along with further analysis and surveying completed in Phase II, Idaho is confident Phase III will provide the opportunity to implement targeted activities/strategies while leveraging existing resources. Phase III should also allow Idaho to make the necessary modifications and improvements at the local and state levels to improve and meet the targets for this indicator.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	4.00	0.34%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	322.00	27.06%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	181.00	15.21%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	442.00	37.14%

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	241.00	20.25%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	623.00	949.00	65.15%	70.20%	65.65%	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 (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	683.00	1190.00	56.25%	58.20%	57.39%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

** FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.*

Was sampling used? No

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

The following is a summary of the FFY 2014 data for indicators 3A, 3B, and 3C:

- 3A1 - Idaho did not meet the FFY 2014 target (60.6%). However, there is no reported slippage from the previous year.
- 3A2 - Idaho met the FFY 2014 target (55.7%).
- 3B1 - Idaho did not meet the FFY 2014 target (64.2%). However, there is no reported slippage from the previous year.
- 3B2 - Idaho did not meet the FFY 2014 target (50.4%) and reported a 1.29% slippage from the previous year.
- 3C1 - Idaho did not meet the FFY 2014 target (70.2%). However, there is no reported slippage from the previous year.
- 3C2 - Idaho did not meet the FFY 2014 target (58.2%). However, there is no reported slippage from the previous year.

Phase I of the SSIP has allowed Idaho to identify strengths and areas for improvement in the Child Outcomes process. Making the Child Outcomes process more meaningful to staff/contractors and families has been a challenge for the state. The program has worked hard to make progress in this area, but there is still much that needs to be done.

Further analysis and surveying completed during Phase II provided valuable information regarding the

activities/strategies Idaho will focus on to improve Child Outcome results. Based on the data and infrastructure analysis and staff/contractor surveys completed in Phase I, along with further analysis and surveying completed in Phase II, Idaho is confident Phase III will provide the opportunity to implement targeted activities/strategies while leveraging existing resources. Phase II will also allow Idaho to make the necessary modifications and improvements at the local and state levels to improve and meet the targets for this indicator.

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2006	Target ≥					59.00%	60.50%	62.00%	63.00%	64.00%	65.00%
		Data			58.20%	60.40%	63.00%	64.80%	63.40%	69.50%	65.78%	68.80%
B	2006	Target ≥					55.00%	56.50%	58.00%	60.00%	61.00%	62.00%
		Data			54.30%	56.80%	59.70%	60.50%	60.90%	65.50%	63.93%	66.18%
C	2006	Target ≥					71.50%	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%
		Data			71.90%	71.90%	73.40%	79.00%	76.90%	79.60%	74.80%	79.59%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	66.00%	67.00%	68.00%	69.00%	70.00%
Target B ≥	63.00%	64.00%	65.00%	66.00%	67.00%
Target C ≥	77.00%	78.00%	79.00%	80.00%	81.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho engaged in the following activities to obtain stakeholder input regarding the FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 SPP indicator targets:

- Central Office Infant Toddler Program reviewed the previous SPP indicator targets and actual data to identify a potential starting point for the new FFY 2013-2018 targets. The following observations were made:
  - **Indicator #4** - Idaho has made steady progress in all family outcomes during the previous Federal Fiscal Years for this indicator. We believe the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) will have a positive impact as well. Targets for FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 were identified using the NCSEAM Family Survey process.
- Central Office staff presented the previous SPP indicator targets and actual data to identify a potential starting point for the new FFY 2013-2018 targets, along with the above observations, to the leadership team during a quarterly Hub Leadership meeting. During this meeting, current resources, the increase in enrollment, and the new SSIP requirements were discussed, as well as how to effectively maintain/improve the SPP Performance Indicators. Using the information from this discussion, draft targets were identified for each SPP indicator to take forward to the Infant Toddler Program Committee and the Early Childhood Coordinating Council.

- The Early Childhood Coordinating Council's Infant Toddler Program Committee met to review and discuss the proposed targets identified during the Hub Leadership meeting. Committee members asked whether the SSIP would impact the current level of performance for any indicators. There may be some impact on performance, but we want to move forward and do our best to continue to make slow and steady progress. The Infant Toddler Program Committee accepted the newly proposed targets and recommended we present them to the Early Childhood Coordinating Council for review and approval.
- The Infant Toddler Program Committee, along with the Part C Coordinator, presented information on previous targets and actual data along with the FFY 2013-2018 SPP targets to the Early Childhood Coordinating Council, with a rationale for how the new targets were identified. Council members fully approved the new targets, especially in light of the current resource capacity and additional work required to complete the SSIP to improve child outcome results.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent families participating in Part C	69.00
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	67.00
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	69.00
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	66.00
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	69.00
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	65.00
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	69.00

	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	68.80%	66.00%	97.10%
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	66.18%	63.00%	95.65%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	79.59%	77.00%	94.20%

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

A family survey workgroup convened in FFY 2014 to obtain stakeholder input on changes to Idaho's family survey process. Idaho is now using the ECO Family Outcomes Survey-Revised (FOS-R) along with different delivery and response methods (refer to additional information section below) to gather family outcome data required by the Office of Special Eduction Programs (OSEP). In addition, central office now directly manages the survey process, analysis, and summary of the data, rather than contracting for these activities.

This indicator presents findings of the FOS-R survey conducted by the Idaho Infant Toddler Program (ITP) to address Indicator 4, the "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."

The survey administered by ITP includes seventeen questions with a 5-point rating scale which assesses the extent to which families have acheived each outcome item, ranging from 1= Not at all helpful to 5 = Extremely Helpful. The survey measures the extent to which early intervention helped families achieve positive outcomes specified in Indicator #4. Idaho's central office data analyst used the recommended FOS-R calculation method to calculate the data reported to OSEP. Additionally, Idaho opted not to include surveys missing an answer for any questions in the data reported to OSEP.

A total of 196 surveys (electronic or paper-based) were identified to be distributed by Service Coordinators to families in either English or Spanish (at six-month review) across all seven regions to all children enrolled between May 1, 2015 and June 30, 2015. Sampling was not used in the survey distribution process.

All survey results are recorded in "Key Survey", an on-line tool used by the Department to create and manage surveys and other documents. A unique child identifier (generated by the program's web-based data system, ITPKIDS), is associated with each survey, enabling tracking of respondent demographics.

In total, 69 surveys were returned in May and June of 2015 for a 35.2% return rate. All 69 surveys were fully completed by survey respondents.

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes
Is it a new or revised collection tool? Yes

- (selected) **Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State**
- ( ) **No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State**

Submitted collection tool: Updated Idaho Family Survey

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Modified Family Survey Tool and Process
In FFY 2014, Idaho revised the Family Survey process and identified a new survey tool to use in gathering data for indicators 4A, 4B, and 4C, due to the following reasons:
Idaho's overall response rate in FFY 2013 was significantly low at 12.99%, one of the lowest in the nation for states using the NCSEAM Family Survey.
Even with targeted improvement activities, Idaho's response rates were consistently low in previous years.
While Idaho's data at the aggregate level met a valid sample size for OSEP SPP/APR reporting purposes, when disaggregated by region, the data wasn't reliable or useful for quality improvement purposes.
Survey results using the Rausch analysis was complex for staff and families.
Family Survey process was inefficient.
Prior to FFY 2014, Idaho used a contractor to handle the family survey process. The contractor was responsible for distributing the surveys by mail one time per year and collecting and analyzing the results. Prior to mailing the surveys, staff delivered postcards to parents informing them they would be receiving a survey in the mail to complete. The contractor tracked the response rates after surveys were mailed and reported return rates. After a few weeks, staff were asked to target outreach to families who had not yet completed the survey
The previous family survey process was time-consuming and unwieldy for staff and families. A high percentage of surveys were returned due to incorrect addresses. As a result, central office and regional staff spent significant time collecting returned envelopes and locating accurate mailing addresses.
In response to these concerns, Idaho put together a project plan to revise the process and identify a new survey tool. Central office started by reviewing the extensive research and data related to the family outcomes indicator on the ECTA website. Idaho contacted and worked with ECTA TA providers to learn about the history

of existing family surveys, who was involved in the development of the surveys, what other states were doing, and what options we had to modify surveys to meet Idaho's needs.

Central office presented information gathered from ECTA and discussed modifying the current family survey process with the hub leadership team. They were excited and agreed the project should be pursued, and unanimously felt that it was important to initiate a stakeholder workgroup to develop the new process.

A workgroup was formed that included parents, hub leaders, an ITP therapist, an administrative support person, and the central office policy team. Members were selected based on role as well as location, to ensure adequate representation across the state. The workgroup met several times via videoconference, and completed assignments via email. The workgroup had the opportunity to brainstorm ideas, review current survey tools, and develop a process that would meet the needs of different families.

The ECO Family Outcomes Survey-Revised (FOS-R), which came highly recommended by ECTA, was shared with the workgroup as a starting point. While the workgroup agreed the FOS-R was an improvement over the NCSEAM Family Survey, they felt it was still too long and not family-friendly. Based on guidance from ECTA TA providers, Idaho was able to make minor modifications to the survey and pare it down to questions required to collect data for indicators 4A, 4B, and 4C.

Once a new survey tool was identified, the workgroup discussed the best delivery and response methods. There was consensus that the service coordinator was the best individual to educate families and be responsible for the process, and that the six-month IFSP review was a good way to embed the family survey into an existing process that is meaningful for families.

In addition, the workgroup identified several response methods, to provide maximum flexibility for families while ensuring high return rates. These new methods provide families with the following options to complete the survey:

In-Person – Bring it to the IFSP Six-Month Review meeting to complete in-person during the meeting, either hard copy or electronically.

Email – Send it in an email for families to complete on their own, prior to the meeting.

Mail – Mail it with the IFSP meeting Prior Written Notice, for families to complete prior to the meeting.

The workgroup's family survey proposal was presented to the hub leadership team for approval. The hub leaders felt very comfortable with the new survey tool and process, and were eager to implement it statewide versus starting with a pilot region. Additionally, the family survey proposal was presented to the Early Childhood Coordinating Council (Idaho's ICC). They were very pleased with the proposal and in full support for implemenation.

All survey results are recorded in "Key Survey", an online tool used by the Department to create and manage surveys and other documents. Key Survey is extremely user-friendly, and has extensive reporting capabilities to use for analysis and quality improvement initiatives. Furthermore, each survey has the child's ITPKIDS web-based data system unique identifier, now allowing the program to link the child outcome and family survey data.

The central office data analyst uses the guidelines provided by ECTA to calculate the family survey results for the FOS-R. Since implementing the new survey process and tool, Idaho's response rate has increased by 20%. Idaho anticipates the response rates will continue to rise as service coordinators and families become more familiar with the new process.

For more in-depth information regarding the family survey process, talking points, and flowcharts, please refer to the "Family Survey Process" section in the Infant Toddler Program (ITP) eManual located on the ITP website (www.infanttoddler.idaho.gov).

Baseline and Targets

Idaho has chosen to wait and change the baseline and target data for indicator #4 in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR. Idaho recognizes that the calculation used for the FOS-R in FFY 2014 yields a different percentage and meaning compared to the previous survey calculation method using the Rausch analysis. However, due to the timeframe of the new Family Survey tool and process being implemented, Idaho was able to collect only two months worth of data to report for the FFY 2014 APR year. Idaho believes that two months of data is not statistically significant/representative to establish new baseline and targets. Additionally, survey results analyzed between May and October of 2015 shows a change in data from what is being reported in FFY 2014. Idaho intends to look at 12 months worth of data and use it to set new baseline and targets in the FFY

2015 SPP/APR.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Not applicable.

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			1.60%	1.62%	1.64%	1.66%	1.68%	1.60%	1.62%	1.64%
Data		1.75%	1.70%	1.91%	1.61%	1.56%	1.22%	1.61%	1.81%	1.76%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	1.66%	1.68%	1.70%	1.73%	1.76%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho engaged in the following activities to obtain stakeholder input regarding the FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 SPP indicator targets:

- Central Office Infant Toddler Program staff reviewed the previous SPP indicator targets and actual data to identify a potential starting point for the new FFY 2013-2018 targets. The following observation was made:
  - **Indicator #5** - During the previous Federal Fiscal Years for this indicator, Idaho remained fairly steady until the 2008 recession. As a result, the state put measures in place to increase the number of birth to one-year-olds and birth to three-year-olds being served, with great success. We anticipate making slow and steady progress, but know this is a potential area of concern due to the Program's resource capacity.
- Central Office staff presented the previous SPP indicator targets and actual data to identify a potential starting point for the new FFY 2013-2018 targets, along with the above observations, to the leadership team during a quarterly Hub Leadership meeting. During this meeting, current resources, the increase in enrollment, and the new SSIP requirements were discussed, as well as how to effectively maintain/improve the SPP Performance Indicators. Using the information from this discussion, draft targets were identified for each SPP indicator to take forward to the Infant Toddler Program Committee and the Early Childhood Coordinating Council.
- The Early Childhood Coordinating Council's Infant Toddler Program Committee met to review and discuss the proposed targets identified during the Hub Leadership meeting. Committee members asked whether the SSIP would impact the current level of performance for any indicators. There may be some impact on peformance, but we want to move forward and do our best to continue to make slow and steady progress. The Infant Toddler Program Committee accepted the newly proposed targets and recommended we present them to the Early Childhood Coordinating Council for review and approval.
- The Infant Toddler Program Committee, along with the Part C Coordinator, presented information on

previous targets and actual data, along with the newly proposed targets, to the Early Childhood Coordinating Council with a rationale for how the new targets were identified. Council members fully approved the new targets, especially in light of the current resource capacity and additional work required to complete the SSIP to improve child outcome results.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	344	null
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013	4/3/2014	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	22,805	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
344	22,805	1.76%	1.66%	1.51%

Explanation of Slippage

The Actual Target for FFY 14 in infants aged birth to one enrolled in Idaho was missed by .15%. Upon further examination, the following challenges have impacted the state's performance for this indicator:

- High turnover rate has impacted the Program's ability to consistently focus on outreach.
- Lack of adequate resources continues to challenge the Program's ability to find and serve Idaho children.
- Some local physicians are choosing not to refer children to the Infant Toddler Program as a result of service provision via a primary service provider model.
- Using existing staff and resources to plan and implement the new State Systemic Improvement Plan.

While Idaho's resources are stretched thin, we believe the small dip in FFY 2014 data is short-lived. Regions have consistently been working with hospitals, physicians, and clinics to educate them regarding the primary service provider model and have provided them with the Journal of the American Academy of Pediatrics article titled "Early Intervention, IDEA Part C Services, and the Medical Home: Collaboration for Best Practice and Best Outcomes." Outreach and education will continue to be done on an ongoing basis to ensure the medical community understands the early intervention evidence-based practices the program has chosen to implement. Additionally, more recent data as of December 2015 shows the Program serving 383 infants and toddlers aged birth to one for 1.67%. This increase reflects the continuous efforts of the

program to monitor enrollment rates and put forth the necessary efforts to increase the percentage of infants less than one year of age receiving early intervention services.

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

Comparison to National Data

Idaho is a state that does not serve "at risk" children. Idaho's identification of infants from birth to one for FFY 2014 compares to other states as follows:

- Idaho placed 2nd in the nation when ranked among other states with Category C (established by the ITCA Data Committee, 2016) eligibility criteria (obtained from IDEA Infant Toddler Coordinators Association.)
- Idaho served 1.51% of its state's infants age birth to one. This figure is .36% above the OSEP national average baseline of 1.15% for all 50 states, D.C., and P.R.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Not applicable.

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			2.74%	2.75%	2.76%	2.78%	2.80%	2.74%	2.75%	2.75%
Data		2.90%	2.77%	2.69%	2.64%	2.52%	2.39%	2.45%	2.78%	2.83%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	2.77%	2.78%	2.81%	2.85%	2.91%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho engaged in the following activities to obtain stakeholder input regarding the FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 SPP indicator targets:

- Central Office Infant Toddler Program staff reviewed the previous SPP indicator targets and actual data to identify a potential starting point for the new FFY 2013-2018 targets. The following observation was made:
  - **Indicator #6** - During the previous Federal Fiscal Years for this indicator, Idaho remained fairly steady until the 2008 recession. As a result, the state put measures in place to increase the number of birth to one-year-olds and birth to three-year-olds being served, with great success. We anticipate making slow and steady progress but know this is a potential area of concern due to the Program's resource capacity.
- Central Office staff presented the previous SPP indicator targets and actual data to identify a potential starting point for the new FFY 2013-2018 targets, along with the above observations, to the leadership team during a quarterly Hub Leadership meeting. During this meeting, current resources, the increase in enrollment, and the new SSIP requirements were discussed, as well as how to effectively maintain/improve the SPP Performance Indicators. Using the information from this discussion, draft targets were identified for each SPP indicator to take forward to the Infant Toddler Program Committee and the Early Childhood Coordinating Council.
- The Early Childhood Coordinating Council's Infant Toddler Program Committee met to review and discuss the proposed targets identified during the Hub Leadership meeting. Committee members asked whether the SSIP would impact the current level of performance for any indicators. There may be some impact on performance, but we want to move forward and do our best to continue to make slow and steady progress. The Infant Toddler Program Committee accepted the newly proposed targets and recommended we present them to the Early Childhood Coordinating Council for review and approval.
- The Infant Toddler Program Committee, along with the Part C Coordinator, presented information on

previous targets and actual data along with the FFY 2013 - 2018 SPP targets to the Early Childhood Coordinating Council, with a rationale for how the new targets were identified. Council members fully approved the new targets, especially in light of the current resource capacity and additional work required to complete the SSIP to improve child outcome results.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	1,802	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013	7/2/2015	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	67,737	

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
1,802	67,737	2.83%	2.77%	2.66%

Explanation of Slippage

The Actual Target for FFY 14 in infants aged birth to three enrolled in Idaho was missed by .11%. Upon further examination, the following challenges have impacted the state's performance for this indicator:

- High turnover rate has impacted the Program's ability to consistently focus on outreach.
- Lack of adequate resources continues to challenge the Program's ability to find and serve Idaho children.
- Some local physicians are choosing not to refer children to the Infant Toddler Program as a result of service provision via a primary service provider model.
- Using existing staff and resources to plan and implement the new State Systemic Improvement Plan.

While Idaho's resources are stretched thin, we believe the small dip in FFY 2014 data is short lived. Regions have consistently been working with hospitals, physicians, and clinics to educate them regarding the primary service provider model and have provided them with the Journal of the American Academy of Pediatrics article titled "Early Intervention, IDEA Part C Services, and the Medical Home: Collaboration for Best Practice and Best Outcomes." Outreach and education will continue to be done on an ongoing basis to ensure the medical community understands the early intervention evidence-based practices the program has chosen to implement. Additionally, more recent data as of December 2015 shows the Program serving 1,941 infants and toddlers aged birth to three for 2.86%. This increase reflects the continuous efforts of the program to monitor enrollment rates and put forth the necessary efforts to increase the percentage of infants

and toddlers birth to three years of age receiving early intervention services.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Comparison to National Data

Idaho is a state that does not serve "at risk" children. Idaho's identification of infants from birth to three for FFY 2014 compares to other states as follows:

- Idaho placed 5th in the nation when ranked among other states with Category C (established by the ITCA Data Committee, 2016) eligibility criteria (obtained from IDEA Infant Toddler Coordinators Association.)
- Idaho served 2.66% of its state's infants age birth to three. This figure is .29% below the OSEP national average baseline of 2.95% for all 50 states, D.C., and P.R.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Not applicable.

Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		90.30%	90.30%	92.70%	87.40%	84.30%	93.60%	98.10%	97.80%	94.10%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
372	498	94.10%	100%	96.59%

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)	109

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

- ○ **State monitoring**
- ◉ **State database**

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

All children enrolled between 4/1/2015 through 6/30/2015.

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

Timely Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs) are calculated based on the actual number of days between the date of referral and the date of the initial Individualized Family Service Plan meeting for each child. In Idaho, the date a referral is received starts the 45-day clock to complete the initial Individualized

Family Service Plan. A statewide report encompassing all initial Individualized Family Service Plans that started 4/1/2015 through 6/30/2015 was generated from ITPKIDS.

Idaho has a number of methods to ensure the accuracy of the 45-day timeline, including:

- Monthly report run by hub leaders to identify missing or inaccurate data.
- Reports run by Central Office staff during the Regional Annual Performance Report, State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, and Corrective Action Plan processes to identify missing or inaccurate data.
- Calculation in ITPKIDS of the timeliness of an initial Individualized Family Service Plan based on the referral date. If the initial Individualized Family Service Plan date is greater than 45 days from the referral date, ITPKIDS requires the user to record a late reason.
- Members of the Central Office ITPKIDS business team are the only users who can modify a referral or Individualized Family Service Plan date in the database.
- A query was developed to capture only initial Individualized Family Service Plan dates from ITPKIDS for a specified period of time.
- Reports run by Infant Toddler Program data analyst and hub leaders to identify referrals currently greater than 45 days, but without an initial Individualized Family Service Plan recorded in ITPKIDS.
- Reports run by Infant Toddler Program data analyst and Central Office that identify incorrect 45-day late reasons recorded by end users.

Corrections are made in ITPKIDS when data inaccuracies are identified. Infant Toddler Program Central Office staff and data analyst work together to identify any state or local error patterns or trends. When patterns are identified, actions to rectify the issues include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Staff training using ITPKIDS through videos, a user guide, and supervisor-led trainings upon hire.
- Collection of qualitative information regarding the data via discussion of issues at quarterly hub leadership meetings for hub leaders to inform their local staff.
- In person, phone, or email communication with hub leaders identifying data areas to be addressed and actions needed.
- The ITPKIDS business team discusses potential modifications to the system to prevent future issues.
- If necessary, modify the ITPKIDS training videos and user guides.
- If necessary, change user access level for specified users.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In Idaho, exceptional family circumstances were included as timely when calculating the IFSP 45-day timeline.

Statewide, one hundred and nine (109) children had delays in IFSPs due to exceptional family/extenuating circumstances as defined by IDEA Part C. Examples of exceptional family circumstances include:

- Conflict with family scheduling/appointment
- Child/family illness or hospitalization
- Family cancelled
- Family moved
- Difficulty making contact with family
- Family indecisiveness to participate in program

Statwide, seventeen (17) children had a delay in IFSPs due to agency reasons. Examples of agency reasons include:

- High referrals/caseloads
- Staff unavailable
- Conflict with agency scheduling appointment
- Delay in receiving documentation to determine eligibility

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings

Not applicable.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Idaho demonstrated that it corrected all findings of non-compliance identified in FFY 2013, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, Idaho reports verification that all EIS programs with non-compliance identified in FFY 2013: (1) are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through onsite monitoring or a State data system; and (2) have corrected each individual case of non-compliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program.

For prong 1 correction, subsequent data (later than June 30, 2014) from ITPKIDS (Idaho's web-based data system) showed that all IFSPs were completed in a timely manner.

For prong 2 correction, data from ITPKIDS showed that IFSPs were created, although late, for all 16 children reported as delayed in FFY 13, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, the family declined services, or the EIS program was umable to contact the family.

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

Correction of each individual incidence of non-compliance is verified through ITPKIDS. ITPKIDS captures the Referral Date and Initial IFSP Date for every child. If the Initial IFSP Date is greater than 45 days from the Referral Date, ITPKIDS requires users to record a delay reason in order to save the service record.

Central Office staff generate and review 45-day IFSP reports using the data from ITPKIDS described above during the annual R-APR, SPP/APR, Corrective Action Plan process, and at other necessary intervals, to verify each individual instance of non-compliance is corrected, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, the family declined services, or the EIS program was unable to contact the family.

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		79.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.10%	98.20%	99.00%	91.40%	97.14%	97.14%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

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

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
102	105	97.14%	100%	97.14%

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

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

- ( ) State monitoring

State database

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

To obtain data for indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C, Central Office personnel pulled a random file sample of 15 files per region from ITPKIDS web-based data system within the full FFY 2014 reporting year - July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015.

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

The following processes describe how this indicator accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs) for the full reporting period:

1. The Central Office data analyst pulled a random file sample from the data system (ITPKIDS) within the FFY 2014 reporting year.
2. The Part C Coordinator sent each region instructions and the list of client names to complete the file sample for indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C.
3. Hub leaders completed the reviews and submitted the results to the Part C Coordinator.
4. The Part C Coordinator reviewed the results, clarified any questions, and calculated the results.
5. The Part C Coordinator used data from ITPKIDS to review and verify information provided in the file review.

To ensure accuracy of the file sample pulled from ITPKIDS, the ITP data analyst and hub leaders run reports on a regular basis to identify any children over the age of three who do not have an exit record recorded in the data system.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings

Not applicable.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Idaho demonstrated that it corrected all findings of non-compliance identified in FFY 2013, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, Idaho reports verification that the EIS programs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2013: (1) are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through onsite monitoring or a State data system; and (2) have corrected each individual case of non-compliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program.

For prong 1 correction, subsequent file sample reviews completed (later than June 30, 2014 and generated

from ITPKIDS web-based data system) showed that all IFSPs were developed 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.

For prong 2 correction, data from the file sample reviews (also housed in ITPKIDS) showed that 3 children were missing transition steps and services in their IFSP. These three children exited the Program prior to correction. Therefore, correction was not possible as the children were no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program. ITP revisited the transition policies, timelines, and worklists in the ITPKIDS web-based data system with local programs to ensure a full understanding of the requirement and timeline for this indicator. In addition, the regions with identified non-compliance identified strategies in their corrective action plans that included a review of regional policies regarding transition, initiating review of IFSPs, implementing ongoing file reviews, and providing targeted training to staff related to transition requirements.

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

Correction of each individual incidence of non-compliance is normally verified through ITPKIDS or file reviews generated by ITPKIDS. However, the three children identified without transition steps and services in their IFSP exited prior to correction. Therefore, there was no need/way to verify correction for these children.

Even though Idaho was not able to correct each instance of no-ncompliance, we revisited the transition policies, timelines, and worklists in the ITPKIDS web-based data system with local programs to ensure a full understanding of the requirement and timeline for this indicator. In addition, the regions with identified non-compliance identified strategies in their corrective action plans that included a review of regional policies regarding transition, initiating review of IFSPs, implementing ongoing file reviews, and providing targeted training to staff related to transition requirements.

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		87.50%	96.10%	100%	100%	99.10%	99.00%	100%	100%	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Explanation of Alternate Data

In the FFY 2014 transition file sample, one child was identified as not being Part B Eligible, thus not requiring an LEA Notification. As a result, the total number of children from the file sample applicable to indicator #8B is 104.

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
103	104	100%	100%	99.04%

Number of parents who opted out (this number will be subtracted from the number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were	0

potentially eligible for Part B when calculating the FFY 2014 Data)	

Explanation of Slippage

In 2013, ITP worked with the Department of Education to streamline the LEA and SEA notification process. Reports were created to identify Part B potentially eligible children by school district, statewide. ITP selected and trained two staff responsible for providing reports to the LEAs and SEA to centralize and standardize the process. The notification process involves sending a report on a monthly basis to the LEAs and a report on a quarterly basis to the SEA.

The centralized notification process has been working very well for ITP since its inception. However, in FFY 2014, one child did not have the LEA/SEA notification sent, due to an incorrect eligibility category recorded in ITPKIDS, thus excluding them from the LEA and SEA Notification reports. While Idaho does not believe this is a systemic issue, a new report has been created that allows staff to review eligibility categories prior to generating and sending the LEA or SEA notifications.

Describe the method used to collect these data

The following method was used to collect data for Indicator 8B:

1. The Central Office data analyst pulled a random file sample from the Infant Toddler Program Key Information Data System (ITPKIDS) within the FFY 2014 reporting year.
2. The Part C Coordinator sent each region instructions and the list of client names to complete the file sample for indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C.
3. Hub leaders completed the reviews and submitted the results to the Part C Coordinator.
4. The Part C Coordinator reviewed the results, clarified any questions, and calculated the results.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? No

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

- ○ State monitoring
- ◉ State database

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

To obtain data for indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C, Central Office personnel pulled a random file sample of 15 files per region from ITPKIDS web-based data system within the full FFY 2014 reporting year - July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015.

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

The following processes describe how this indicator accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs) for the full reporting period:

1. The Central Office data analyst pulled a random file sample from the data system (ITPKIDS) within the FFY 2014 reporting year.
2. The Part C Coordinator sent each region instructions and the list of client names to complete the file sample for indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C.
3. Hub leaders completed the reviews and submitted the results to the Part C Coordinator.
4. The Part C Coordinator reviewed the results, clarified any questions, and calculated the results.
5. The Part C Coordinator used data from ITPKIDS to review and verify information provided in the file

review.

To ensure accuracy of the file sample pulled from ITPKIDS, the ITP data analyst and hub leaders run reports on a regular basis to identify any children over the age of three who do not have an exit record recorded in the data system.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings

Not applicable.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		84.00%	97.00%	99.00%	100%	99.10%	98.00%	98.00%	100%	92.31%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Explanation of Alternate Data

In the transition file sample, one child was identified as not being Part B Eligible, thus not requiring an Transition Conference. As a result, the total number of children from the file sample applicable to indicator #8C is 104.

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

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
89	104	92.31%	100%	90.38%

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference (this number will be subtracted from the number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B when calculating the FFY 2014 Data)	0
Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B)	5

Explanation of Slippage

Three local areas continue to have difficulty scheduling transition conferences with school districts for children Part B Potentially Eligible within the required Part C timelines. Even though Part C has the requirement of holding a transition conference at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday, school district representatives continue to be reluctant to participate in the Part C transition conference earlier than a month or so before the child turns three years of age. Their preference is still to hold one meeting that encompasses the Part C Transition Meeting, Part B Eligibility Determination, and sometimes Individualized Education Program (IEP) development. As a result of this issue, Infant Toddler Program Service Coordinators continue to find it challenging to schedule and conduct the Part C Transition Conference at least 90 days prior to the child's third birthday to ensure the presence of a school district representative within the required time frame, without burdening families. ITP continues to hold transition meetings, although sometimes late, unless families choose not to participate in a transition meeting or the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the program.

The Idaho Infant Toddler Program plans to take the following actions to better coordinate with Part B school districts and better clarify Part C and Part B regulatory requirements:

1. Create a proposal to develop one standardized statewide Interagency Agreement (IAG) between Part C and Part B that clearly identifies responsibilities and timelines instead of maintaining individualized IAG's locally.
2. In Idaho, the Part B Coordinator has no jurisdiction over the local Part B school programs. Therefore, it is difficult to enforce consistency across the state. The Part C Coordinator will continue to collaborate with the Part B Coordinator to address these issues.
3. The Part C and Part B Coordinators will provide statewide training opportunities regarding the transition process, requirements, and timelines for the Infant Toddler Program and school districts in 2016.
4. Continue to train ITP Service Coordinators that a school district representative must be invited to the transition meeting, but we (Part C) must hold the Part C Transition Conference in accordance with the timeline identified in the Part C Regulations regardless of whether they attend or not. Service Coordinators will continue to communicate with local school districts regarding the scheduling of transition meetings. However, ITP has no control over the hundreds of school districts in Idaho and how or if they choose to collaborate and communicate with ITP.

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

To obtain data for indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C, Central Office personnel pulled a random file sample of 15 files per region from ITPKIDS web-based data system within the full FFY 2014 reporting year - July 1, 2014 through June 30,

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

The following processes describe how this indicator accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs) for the full reporting period:

1. The Central Office data analyst pulled a random file sample from the data system (ITPKIDS) within the

FFY 2014 reporting year.

2. The Part C Coordinator sent each region instructions and the list of client names to complete the file sample for indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C.
3. Hub leaders completed the reviews and submitted the results to the Part C Coordinator.
4. The Part C Coordinator reviewed the results, clarified any questions, and calculated the results.
5. The Part C Coordinator used data from ITPKIDS to review and verify information provided in the file review.

To ensure accuracy of the file sample pulled from ITPKIDS, the ITP data analyst and hub leaders run reports on a regular basis to identify any children over the age of three who do not have an exit record recorded in the data system.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings

Not applicable.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Idaho demonstrated that it corrected all findings of non-compliance identified in FFY 2013, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, Idaho reports verification that the EIS programs with non-compliance identified in FFY 2013: (1) are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through onsite monitoring or a State data system; and (2) have corrected each individual case of non-compliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program.

For prong 1 correction, subsequent file sample reviews completed (later than June 30, 2014 and generated from ITPKIDS web-based data system) showed that all transition meetings were held at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months prior to the child's third birthday.

For prong 2 correction, data from the file reviews and ITPKIDS showed that the transition meetings were held, although late, for all 8 children reported as delayed in FFY 13, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, the family declined services, or the EIS program was unable to contact the family.

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

Correction of each individual incidence of non-compliance is verified through a file review and ITPKIDS. ITPKIDS captures the transition meeting date for every child. If the Actual Start Date is later than the

Projected Start Date, ITPKIDS requires users to record a delay reason before the user can save the service record.

Central Office staff generate and review transition meeting dates using the data from file reviews and ITPKIDS described above during the annual R-APR, SPP/APR, Corrective Action Plan process, and at other necessary intervals to verify each individual instance of non-compliance is corrected, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, the family declined services, or the EIS program was unable to contact the family.

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

Indicator #9 is not applicable as Part B due process procedures have not been adopted by Idaho Part C.

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)

This indicator is not applicable.

Indicator 10: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥					

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho has not received any mediation requests since the inception of the SPP/APR. As a result, Idaho is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

Prepopulated Data

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Idaho did not receive any mediation requests in FFY 2014.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Not applicable.

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014
Target		56.50%
Data	56.50%	

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	56.50%	56.50%	59.00%	60.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Overview

Data Analysis

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

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in EIS programs and/or EIS providers to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and other early learning initiatives, such as Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge and the Home Visiting program and describe the extent that

these new initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

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

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

Statement

Description

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

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

Theory of Action

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

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

☐ **Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)**

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

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

Selected: Lead Agency Director

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

Name: RICHARD M. ARMSTRONG

Title: DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND WELFARE

Email: ARMSTRONG@DHW.IDAHO.GOV

Phone: 208-334-5500