ID
Part C

FFY2015
State Performance Plan /
Annual Performance Report

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

Executive Summary:

Overall, the FFY 2015 Annual Performance Report was a good year for the Idaho Infant Toddler Program with consistent data performance. Additionally, Idaho has continued to work very hard on implementing, measuring, and refining SSIP strategies outlined in the implementation plan for phase III to ensure the highest level of results are achieved.

In June of 2016, the Governor's Early Childhood Coordinating Council (EC3) that served as Idaho's Part C Interagency Coordinating Council was disbanded. As a result, the Infant Toddler Program created a new Infant Toddler Coordinating Council (ITCC) to serve as the state's Part C Interagency Coordinating Council. Fortunately, the seven Regional Early Childhood Committees are still in place, under the umbrella of the ITCC. Putting the new ITCC together in such a short period of time and reorienting the Regional Committees solely towards early intervention was a challenging and time consuming effort. However, we were able to have several EC3 members appointed to the new ITCC, allowing for a fairly smooth transition. We anticipate that the new Regional Committees will be able to address the unique needs of their individual regions in terms of child find outreach and community relationships.

During FFY 2015, Idaho was able to complete quarterly reviews of the new Family Survey tool and methodology. Valuable information was gathered and used to assist in making informed modifications to the survey distribution process. Please see indicator #4 for more detailed information.

Several regions faced continued challenges in scheduling and holding Transition Conferences with some school districts within the required Part C timelines. These regions struggled with balancing the timeliness requirements and getting Part B representatives to attend the conference. Please refer to indicator #8 for more detailed information.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

General Supervision System:

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

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

Overview of Monitoring System

The Infant Toddler Program uses 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 of Idaho.

- The lead Agency monitors data pertaining to these standards and indicators on a regular basis.
- Many indicators are monitored on a regular basis by hub leaders and human service supervisors.
- Summary reports are routinely provided to Early Childhood Coordinating Council Infant Toddler Coordinating Council and other stakeholders. The new Infant Toddler Coordinating Council received an overview of the requirements of the SPP/APR at their first meeting in September 2016. In November 2016 they were oriented regarding their responsibility to review the APR for accuracy and completeness and provide signature certification of the APR to be submitted. They also met on January 9, 2017 to review the each indicator in the FFY 2015 APR.
- Monitoring data is used to inform discussions and policy decisions.
- The state's web-based data system and the Early Childhood Outcome (ECO) Family Outcomes Survey-Revised (FOS-R) are 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 Infant Toddler Coordinating CouncilEarly Childhood Coordinating Council, Infant Toddler Program Committee, and the Regional Early Childhood Committees.

Data System and Verification
The Idaho Infant Toddler Program's electronic data collection and management system is a web-based system that contains all collected child enrollment, demographic, caregiver data, as well as service coordination provision, eligibility categories, and service categories. The web-based data system has undergone extensive revisions to create improved capacity for data collection, analysis, report generation, and billing capabilities, and it continues to be enhanced. 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;
- 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 reviews the web-based data entry to ensure accuracy, reliability, non-duplication, etc. at regular intervals using Crystal Report software, and 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
The Lead Agency conducts a 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 when 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 called 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 it to regional 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 provides 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). To help achieve

the targeted objectives, regional programs include baseline data and measurable, time-specific objectives and performance targets, as well as identified needs for TA and training in corrective action and enhancement plans. 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. For 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 use of 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 on 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 request mediation or due process, the 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. The 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 the timeliness of completion of findings/resolutions, and analyzes data to modify policies, procedures and practices where necessary.

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 the SPP/APR. A focused monitoring system is also used in SPP/APR development.

<u>Enforcement, Including Sanctions</u>

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

- Reporting data to the public.
- Using results of the program's self-assessment and focused monitoring to identify non-compliance, target technical assistance, and support programs in developing meaningful and effective improvement plans.
- Reviewing compliance or performance issues with the Infant Toddler Coordinating Council (previously the Early Childhood 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 for 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.
- Mentorship and reflective supervision with statewide mentors and multi-disciplinary teams.
- 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.
- 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 families 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 social-emotional 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 an 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 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 the development of their children by encouraging and facilitating full participation 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 is available, as needed. Early intervention providers are provided training in the principles of evidence-based practices for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. 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, Maternal and Infant Early Childhood Home Visitors, and Special Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) clinicians are examples of target audiences included in the program's outreach efforts.

Training efforts are coordinated with child care initiatives on inclusion and integration in child care settings of the child with a disability. Additional future 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 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 Infant Toddler 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 in the state, 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 their findings 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 first to the EC3's Infant Toddler Program Committee and then to the full 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 has developed contract language 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** - A new baseline and targets were set in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR. The new baseline was set using the 2nd and 3rd quarters' data and new targets were set based on continued efforts to solidify the new family survey process. Realistic gains are expected to be made by FFY 2018. 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 2017.
- 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 program's 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 2013 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 2013 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 2013 APR in 2015, is available.

Idaho will post results on the performance of all seven regions and the state for the FFY 2015 SPP/APR on the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare's Idaho Infant Toddler Program website (www.infanttoddler.idaho.gov) no later than February 1, 2017 for any member of the public to access as we submit the FFY 2015 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 Infant Toddler Coordinating Council.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

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	2014
Target			100%	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%	95.77%

Key: ⬜ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   🟨 Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2015 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
1869	2210	95.77%	100%	93.08%

Explanation of Slippage

Two of the seven regions in Idaho encountered challenges with providing services to children in a timely fashion during FFY 2015 due to contractor turnover and staff being on extended leave, thus affecting the overall FFY 2015 state-level data. These two regions comprise the West Hub, which is the most urban area in Idaho with the highest number of children served.

Since the Idaho Infant Toddler Program has a limited number of state positions, it relies heavily on contractors to provide Part C early intervention services. Both regions encountered challenges finding and keeping service providers (over 20 positions, most of them contractors). The challenges include, but are not limited to:

- Finding contractors who are willing to work for the program full time. In many instances, the contractors can only offer the Program 10-20 hours per week.
- Reluctance on the part of contractors to provide services in the child's natural environment due to lower reimbursement rates for travel and the ease of seeing children in a clinic setting.
- Contractors can make more money working for a hospital or private clinic and serve more children per day.
- Contractors see the necessary IDEA, Part C documentation as an additional paperwork burden that is not required in a clinic setting.
- Contractors are unwilling to adhere to early intervention evidence-based practices or put in the necessary time to be trained and mentored in these practices.
- The West Hub community has many more, and more lucrative employment opportunities for therapists.

The West Hub direct service hub leader has been working on filling the vacant contracted positions in each region. One region just became fully staffed in December of 2016 and the other region is still in need of an occupational therapist and a speech therapist.

During these vacancies, the West Hub leader was thoughtful and intentional in allocating resources to maximize coverage. She used her small cadre of state staff therapists to

cover harder-to-fill areas instead of utilizing contractors. Additionally, she improved the onboarding process for new contractors to ensure that potential contractors were well informed about the evidence-based early intervention practices used in the Infant Toddler Program. New contractors now receive a sample contract that clearly explains reimbursement, natural environment requirements, and the provision of evidence-based early intervention services.

Additionally, the Infant Toddler Program worked at the state level to obtain approval from the Governor's office to shift funds from Trustee and Benefits to Personnel and reclassify positions to therapists as vacancies occur. Our ultimate goal is to have one to two state staff physical therapists, one occupational therapists, and one speech language pathologists in each of the seven regions.

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances *This number will be added to the "Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.*	188

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 2015 reporting year - July 1, 2015 - June 30, 2016

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 2015 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 use Crystal Reports on a weekly-to-monthly basis to identify any missing or inaccurate data.
- Standardized quarterly QA review in each region of data and continuing service reports recorded in ITPKIDS matching documents uploaded in ITPKIDS.
- Central Office generates reports for the annual R-APR, SPP/APR, and Corrective Action Plan processes to identify missing or inaccurate data.
- The program's data system, ITPKIDS, allows only one Projected and Actual Start Date to be recorded for a service.
- User access to add and edit Projected and Actual Start Dates is limited, which assures the accuracy of data.
- The Infant Toddler Program data analyst provides program managers and hub leaders with quarterly and annual summary reports on timeliness and identifies any necessary data cleanup.
- The 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.
- The Infant Toddler Program data analyst and central office runs reports quarterly and annually to analyze the reasons for late services and looks for any anomalies that may indicate data entry errors or training needs.

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 level 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, users 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 and contractors.
- In person, phone, or email communication with hub leaders identifying data areas to be addressed and necessary follow up.
- ITPKIDS business team discusses potential modifications to the system to prevent future issues.

- If necessary, ITPKIDS training videos and users guide are modified.
- If necessary, user access levels for specified users are modified.

☑ **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, one hundred and eighty-eight (188) children experienced delays in timely service delivery due to exceptional family/extenuating circumstances. Examples of family circumstances include:

- Unable to contact family
- Family declined service
- Family no show
- Conflict with family scheduling appointment
- Child/family illness or hospitalization
- Family request for later service start data

Statewide, one hundred and fifty-three (153) experienced a delay in timely services due to agency reasons. Examples of agency reasons include:

- High caseload/therapist unavailable
- Delay in evaluation
- Therapist ill
- Interpretation/translation issue

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Not applicable.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

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	1	null	1

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Idaho demonstrated that it corrected one of two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014. Consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02, Idaho reports verification that one of the two EIS programs with noncompliance in FFY 2014 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance). These findings are based on a review of subsequently collected data through on-site monitoring or a State data system. Idaho also reports verification that both EIS programs with noncompliance in FFY 2014 have corrected each individual case of noncompliance, with the exception of children no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program.

For prong 1, subsequent data (later than June 30, 2015) from ITPKIDS (Idaho's web-based data system, showed that all services were provided in a timely manner for one of the two EIS programs with noncompliance. The second program is still working to achieve full compliance for prong 1 by showing all services were provided in a timely manner using subsequent data.

For prong 2 correction, data from ITPKIDS showed that the services identified in IFSPs were provided, although late, for all 97 children reported as delayed in FFY 2014, 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 individual case of noncompliance was corrected

Correction of each individual incidence of noncompliance 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 that 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 make contact with the family.

FFY 2014 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

One region continues to work on correcting FFY 2014 non-compliance. A corrective action plan was developed by the region and approved by central office to address and correct non-compliance. The corrective action plan includes strategies that will be taken to ensure correction. Additionally, a required evidence of change section includes the data required to correct prong 1 and prong 2 non-compliance.

The above region's non-compliance was not rectified within one year of identification due, in large part, to 9 vacated contractor and staff positions. They have worked on recruiting for these positions over the past year and a half. It has been a long and arduous process for the West Hub leader to fill these positions. With much perseverance, the all vacant contractor and state staff positions have been filled, as of December 2016.

The required evidence of change data in their corrective action plan has shown this region is making good progress towards achieving full compliance. Their first evidence of change data report showed 70.5% with their most recent data report showing 87.2%. Both Central Office and the region feel confident that full compliance will be achieved soon.

Central Office will continue to work with the region to ensure correction happens as soon as possible. If necessary, new corrective action plan strategies and evidence of change statements will be identified to further the correction efforts.

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	2014
Target ≥			92.30%	92.50%	92.70%	92.90%	93.00%	94.00%	94.50%	95.00%	95.30%
Data		92.50%	92.60%	93.10%	96.70%	99.00%	95.30%	96.20%	97.30%	98.52%	99.17%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	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 strong policies and procedures in place and has developed contract language to ensure continued success.
- 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 program's 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 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	1,929	
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	1,931	

FFY 2015 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
1,929	1,931	99.17%	95.50%	99.90%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Not applicable.

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	2014
A1	2009	Target ≥						72.10%	64.80%	65.00%	65.20%	60.40%	60.60%
		Data					71.60%	64.60%	61.40%	60.28%	59.80%	57.50%	58.11%
A2	2009	Target ≥						56.40%	53.50%	53.70%	53.90%	55.50%	55.70%
		Data					55.90%	53.30%	51.50%	54.16%	55.30%	53.15%	55.80%
B1	2009	Target ≥						73.10%	67.30%	67.50%	67.70%	64.00%	64.20%
		Data					72.60%	67.10%	62.30%	63.97%	65.00%	59.93%	61.07%
B2	2009	Target ≥						53.50%	50.60%	50.80%	51.00%	50.20%	50.40%
		Data					53.00%	50.40%	47.90%	50.00%	49.40%	48.85%	47.56%
C1	2009	Target ≥						75.30%	70.40%	70.60%	70.80%	70.00%	70.20%
		Data					74.80%	70.20%	67.60%	66.60%	66.90%	65.15%	65.65%
C2	2009	Target ≥						62.10%	58.46%	58.60%	58.80%	58.00%	58.20%
		Data					61.60%	58.20%	57.10%	58.30%	57.40%	56.25%	57.39%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	61.00%	61.50%	63.00%	65.00%
Target A2 ≥	56.00%	56.50%	57.00%	57.50%
Target B1 ≥	64.80%	65.20%	65.60%	67.20%
Target B2 ≥	50.80%	51.20%	51.60%	52.00%
Target C1 ≥	70.60%	71.00%	71.40%	71.80%
Target C2 ≥	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 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	1316.00

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	4.00	0.30%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	410.00	31.16%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	169.00	12.84%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	372.00	28.27%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	361.00	27.43%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 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).	541.00	955.00	58.11%	61.00%	56.65%
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).	733.00	1316.00	55.80%	56.00%	55.70%

Explanation of A1 Slippage

Idaho continues to encounter challenges meeting the target for indicator 3A1. Continued work on the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) will provide the opportunity to implement targeted activities/strategies to ensure the necessary trainings, modifications, and improvements occur at the local and state levels to improve social-emotional outcomes for the infants and toddlers we serve.

Early Childhood Outcome (ECO) talking points, benefits of embedding ECO practices throughout ITP processes, and examples of information that can be gathered at different stages of our processes were developed by central office and hub leaders. Hub leaders provided the information to staff and contractors during regularly scheduled local meetings in 2016. ECO training is currently being developed for all staff and contractors to ensure their understanding of the process and use of required tools and resources. Training will be delivered to SSIP implementation sites in 2017.

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	3.00	0.23%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	443.00	33.66%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	239.00	18.16%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	442.00	33.59%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	189.00	14.36%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 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).	681.00	1127.00	61.07%	64.80%	60.43%
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).	631.00	1316.00	47.56%	50.80%	47.95%

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	3.00	0.23%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	359.00	27.28%

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	187.00	14.21%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	508.00	38.60%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	259.00	19.68%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 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).	695.00	1057.00	65.65%	70.60%	65.75%
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).	767.00	1316.00	57.39%	58.60%	58.28%

Was sampling used?   No

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

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Not applicable.

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	2014
A	2015	Target ≥					59.00%	60.50%	62.00%	63.00%	64.00%	65.00%	66.00%
		Data			58.20%	60.40%	63.00%	64.80%	63.40%	69.50%	65.78%	68.80%	97.10%
B	2015	Target ≥					55.00%	56.50%	58.00%	60.00%	61.00%	62.00%	63.00%
		Data			54.30%	56.80%	59.70%	60.50%	60.90%	65.50%	63.93%	66.18%	95.65%
C	2015	Target ≥					71.50%	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%	77.00%
		Data			71.90%	71.90%	73.40%	79.00%	76.90%	79.60%	74.80%	79.59%	94.20%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	92.93%	92.93%	93.00%	94.00%
Target B ≥	92.68%	92.68%	93.00%	94.00%
Target C ≥	90.98%	90.98%	92.00%	93.00%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

Idaho changed the survey tool used for indicator#4 from the NCSEAM Family Survey to the ECO Family Outcomes Survey-Revised (FOS-R). As a result, and per OSEPs direction, Idaho modified their baseline (using FFY 2015 data) and targets for FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 for indicator #4.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Previous Stakeholder Input (FFY 2006-2014)

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 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 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.

New Stakeholder Input (FFY 2015 - FFY 2018)

A family survey work group convened in FFY 2014 to obtain stakeholder input on changes to Idaho's family survey tool and process. As a result, Idaho is now using the ECO Family Outcomes Survey-Revised (FOS-R) along with different delivery and response methods to gather family outcome data required by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). As a result of using a different survey tool with different calculation methodologies, Idaho was tasked with identifying new baseline data using FFY 2015 data and new targets for FFY 2016 - FFY 2018.

Idaho engaged in the following activities to obtain stakeholder input regarding setting the new baseline using FFY 2015 data and new targets for FFY 2016 - FFY 2018:

- Central Office Infant Toddler Program reviewed the new data to identify a potential starting point with the new baseline and FFY 2016 - 2018 targets:

  - Data was calculated using survey results from the 2nd and 3rd quarter. This data set represented when fidelity to the new methodology seemed to be the greatest. Proposed targets were discussed based on continued efforts to solidify the new process as well as realistic gains expected to be made by FFY 2018.

- Central Office staff presented the current data to identify a proposed FFY 2015 baseline and a potential starting point for the new FFY 2016-2018 targets to the leadership team during a quarterly Hub Leadership meeting. During this meeting, current resources, the continued family survey improvement process, and the continued SSIP requirements were discussed, as well as how to effectively improve performance for this indicator. Based on the data above, a proposed FFY 2015 baseline and new targets for FFY 2016-2018 were developed and ready to take forward to the Infant Toddler Coordinating Council.

- The Part C Coordinator and data manager presented information on the previous and new family survey tool and process, previous baseline, targets, and actual data along with the newly proposed FFY 2015 baseline and FFY 2016-2018 targets to the Infant Toddler Coordinating Council with a rationale for how the new baseline and targets were identified. Council members fully approved the new targets, especially in light of the newer family survey process and resources necessary to implement the new process.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent families participating in Part C	410.00
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	381.00
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	410.00
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	380.00
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	410.00
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	373.00
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	410.00

	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	97.10%	92.93%	92.93%
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	95.65%	92.68%	92.68%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	94.20%	90.98%	90.98%

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

In FFY 2015 Idaho continued using the survey process that was adopted in April of 2015. This process uses the ECO Family Outcomes Survey-Revised (FOS-R) to gather family outcome data required by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). Central Office 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 achieved 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. Idaho opted not to include surveys missing an answer for any questions in the data reported to OSEP.

All survey results are recorded in "Key Survey", an online tool used by the Department to create and manage surveys and other documents. A unique child identifier (randomly generated by the program's web-based data system, ITPKIDS), is associated with each survey, enabling tracking of respondent demographics. This identifier is also used to eliminate duplicate responses and to ensure that responses are valid (based on the requirement that surveys be given only at 6-month IFSP reviews).

At the beginning of the FFY, from July-August, the data analyst met with service coordinators responsible for administering the survey to assess the fidelity of the process in the regions and to answer questions about the

survey process.   During those visits, it became clear that not all service coordinators were offering the survey at the 6-month IFSP reviews. For that reason, the first quarter of FFY 2015 data was excluded from calculations as the true denominator was not determinable.

During the year, from July 1, 2015-June 30, 2016, the data analyst continued to communicate with the leadership team and others involved in the processing of the survey responses. The expectation was that as service coordinators became more comfortable with the process, the number of online surveys would increase. Instead, the number decreased to almost none in most areas by the fourth quarter. Also, the questions from administrative staff that were being received in the central office started showing signs that the surveys were not being handled consistently after completion by the families. Some surveys were returned without an envelope, some folded, and some mailed to the regional office. Due to a concern that a lack of anonymity from the varied methods may be impacting responses, the fourth quarter of data was also excluded from the FFY2015 data.

For these reasons, we believe that the 2nd and 3rd quarters of data represent when the family survey was implemented with the most fidelity. The response rates by regions for that time period ranged from 31% to 64%, for an overall percentage of 46% statewide.   The surveys were available on paper and online both in English and Spanish.   Sampling was not used in the distribution process as every child with a 6 month IFSP review between Oct 1, 2015 and March 31, 2016 should have been offered participation in the family survey. In total, 410 valid, completed surveys were received.

Was sampling used?   No

Was a collection tool used?   Yes
Is it a new or revised collection tool?   No

( ) **Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State**

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

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

In FFY 2015, the new Family Survey process was continued that began in April of FFY2014. As a result of having a full year of the new methodology, the process was reviewed regularly over the year and a new baseline for FFY 15 was determined and new targets were identified for FFY 16-18. By continually monitoring the new process the following changes and observations were made:

Quarter 1 - The new process created an unexpected lag in the analysis of the response rates which severely limited being able to share ongoing, up-to-date information with program leadership and stakeholders. The process of submitting the paper survey involved the family either handing the paper survey in a sealed envelope to the service coordinator who then submitted it to the administrative assistant in the local office, or mailing it directly to the local office. Then the local office scanned the surveys once per month and submitted those to the central office where someone then entered them into the online database. At times, data entry occurred as much as two months after the survey was received.

Quarter 2 - Invalid surveys began being received and then tracked. They often could not be associated with a client, so they were only traceable at the state level instead of the regional level which would have been preferable. The most common causes of invalid surveys were missing survey ID numbers, surveys given at times other than at the 6 month IFSP reviews, or surveys that were incomplete. Overall, approximately 1 out of 7 paper surveys received were invalid.

Quarter 3 - Questions received from administrative staff or service coordinators in the regions began to raise concerns that procedures to ensure confidentiality of the survey were not being maintained. Each region's administrative assistant was contacted and it was learned that surveys were being received in a variety of states – in sealed envelopes, folded but not in envelopes, not folded – sometimes allowing service coordinators to see families' responses that were intended to be confidential.

Quarter 4 – Based on the growing concerns over fidelity to the methodology and the delays in data reporting because of the process and lack of use of the electronic survey option, the research analyst and program managers began considering modifications for the following year and establishing the new baseline. With input from hub leadership and central office staff, the following determinations were made and benefits identified:

Quarters 2 and 3 would be used to establish the baselines as they were when fidelity to the methodology appeared to be the greatest.

Paper surveys would no longer be offered to families as an option from the service coordinators. Service coordinators would only send invitations to the online survey as text messages and emails. If families wanted to complete the survey on paper, they would be given information about how to do so and central office would handle those requests.

Service coordinators' role would only be to present the invitation for participation in the survey and the importance of feedback for program improvement. They were no longer to feel responsible for ensuring that the family submitted a response.

Hub Leaders were trained in person, then follow-up occurred with a phone call from the research analyst to ensure understanding of the new process and the benefits.

With electronic surveys, QA checks will be able to be completed and data reports will be available as soon as surveys are completed with no time lag.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Not applicable.

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	2014
Target ≥			1.60%	1.62%	1.64%	1.66%	1.68%	1.60%	1.62%	1.64%	1.66%
Data		1.75%	1.70%	1.91%	1.61%	1.56%	1.22%	1.61%	1.81%	1.76%	1.51%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	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 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 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 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	376	null
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2015	6/30/2016	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	22,649	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
376	22,649	1.51%	1.68%	1.66%

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

Idaho is a state that does not serve "at risk" children. Idaho's identification of infants from birth to one for FFY 2015 compares to other states as follows:

- Idaho placed 2nd in the nation when ranked among other states with Category C (established by the ITC Data Committee, 2016) eligibility criteria (obtained form IDEA Infant Toddler Coordinators Association.)
- Idaho served 1.66% of its state's infants age birth to one. This figure is .42% above the OSEP national baseline of 1.24% for all 50 dates, D.C., and P.R.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Not applicable.

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	2014
Target ≥			2.74%	2.75%	2.76%	2.78%	2.80%	2.74%	2.75%	2.75%	2.77%
Data		2.90%	2.77%	2.69%	2.64%	2.52%	2.39%	2.45%	2.78%	2.83%	2.66%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	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

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	1,931	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2015	6/30/2016	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	67,641	

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
1,931	67,641	2.66%	2.78%	2.85%

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

Idaho is a state that does not serve "at risk" children. Idaho's identification of infants from birth to three for FFY 2015 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, 2017) eligibility criteria (obtained from IDEA Infant Toddler Coordinator Association.)

- Idaho served 2.85% of its state's infants age birth to three. This figure is 1.13% below the OSEP national average baseline of 3.98% for all 50 dates, D.C., and P.R.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Not applicable.

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	2014
Target			100%	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%	96.59%

Key: ▨ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   ▨ Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2015 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
337	475	96.59%	100%	97.68%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances *This number will be added to the "Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.*	127

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 4/1/2016 through 6/30/2016.

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 child's initial Individualized Family Service Plan meeting. In Idaho, the 45-day clock to complete the initial Individualized Family Service Plan begins the date a referral is received. A statewide report encompassing all initial Individualized Family Service Plans completed on 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 reports 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.
- Only members of the Central Office ITPKIDS business team may modify a referral or Individualized Family Service Plan date recorded in the database.
- An ITPKIDS query captures the dates of initial IFSPs for a specified period of time.
- Reports run by Infant Toddler Program data analyst and hub leaders that identify referrals currently greater than 45 days that do not have an initial IFSP 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 through ITPKIDS training videos, user guides, 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, the ITPKIDS training videos and user guides are modified.
- If necessary, access is modified 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 twenty-seven (127) children experienced delays in IFSPs due to exceptional family/extenuating circumstances as defined by IDEA Part C. Examples of exceptional family circumstances include:

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

Statewide, eleven (11) children experienced a delay in IFSPs due to agency reasons. Examples of agency reasons include:

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

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Not applicable.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	null	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Idaho demonstrated that it corrected all findings of non-compliance identified in FFY 2014, consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, Idaho reports verification that the one program with non-compliance in FFY 2014: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through 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 program.

For prong 1 correction, subsequent data (later than June 30, 2015) from ITPKIDS (Idaho's web-based data system) showed that all IFSPs were completed in a timely manner.

For prong 2 correction, data form ITPKIDS showed that IFSPs were created, although late, for all 17 children reported delayed in FFY 2014, 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 individual case of noncompliance was corrected

Correction of each individual incidence of non-compliance is verified through ITPKIDS. ITPKIDS captures the Referral Date and the Initial IFSP Data 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	2014
Target			100%	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%	97.14%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2015 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 <u>services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday.</u>

◉ 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
103	105	97.14%	100%	98.10%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances *This number will be added to the "Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.*	0

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

◯ State 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 data analyst pulled a random file sample comprising 15 files per region from ITPKIDS web-based data system within the full FFY 2015 reporting year -(July 1, 2015 - June 30, 2016).

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 2015 reporting year.
2. The Part C Coordinator sent each region instructions and the list of child names to complete the file review 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 the findings of the file review.

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

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Not applicable.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	null	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Idaho demonstrated that it corrected all findings of non-compliance identified in FFY 2014, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, Idaho reports verification that the EIS programs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through onsite 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 file sample reviews completed (later than June 30, 2015 and generated form ITPKIDS web-based data system) showed 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 child's third birthday.

For prong 2 correction, data from the FFY 2014 file sample reviews (also contained 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 worklist 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 region identified the following strategies in their corrective action plan:

- Review procedures to ensure standardization of transition processes across the Hub.
- Continue to review procedures and policies with the intent to identify needs and provide a consistent transition process.

- Monthly review of Crystal Report "Critical Dates by Service Coordinator."

- Monthly samples review of IFSP's for transition goals.

- Review of status, by month, at the Regional Hub Leadership Meeting.

- Regional staff will work with Central Office to explore topic-specific training as needed.

- All Service Coordinators will attend at least 2 trainings a year to assist with consistency of Service Coordination practices.

- Establish consistent transition processes across the Hub that ensure transition goals are in the IFSP of each child transitioning out of the program.

  1) Service Coordination will ensure Transition meetings continue to take place prior to age 2 years, 9 months.

  2) Service Coordinators will continue to ensure all IFSP's meet the standard related to transition goals.

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

Correction of each individual instance of noncompliance is normally verified through ITPKIDS or file reviews generated by ITPKIDS. However, the three children identified without transition steps and services in their IFSP in FFY 2014 exited prior to correction. Therefore, it was not possible to verify correction for these children.

Even though Idaho was not able to correct each instance of noncompliance, we retrained local program staff on the transition policies, timelines, and worklist in the ITPKIDS web-based data system to ensure a full understanding of the requirements and timelines for this indicator. In addition, the region identified strategies in their corrective action plan that included reviewing regional policies regarding transition, reviewing IFSPs, and providing training to staff related to IFSP transition steps and services requirements.

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	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		87.50%	96.10%	100%	100%	99.10%	99.00%	100%	100%	100%	99.04%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

⦿ Yes
○ No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
104	105	99.04%	100%	99.05%

Number of parents who opted out *This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.*	0

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 2015 reporting year.
2. The Part C Coordinator sent each region instructions and the list of client names to complete the file review 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/verified the findings, 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 data analyst pulled a random file sample comprising 15 files per region from ITPKIDS web-based data system within the full FFY 2015 reporting year -(July 1, 2015 - June 30, 2016).

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 2015 reporting year.
2. The Part C Coordinator sent each region instructions and the list of child names to complete the file review 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 the findings of the file review.

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

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Not applicable.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

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

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	2014
Target			100%	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%	90.38%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

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

◉ Yes
○ No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
67	105	90.38%	100%	79.05%

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference *This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.*	null
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" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.*	16

Explanation of Slippage

Idaho's service area comprises 136 school districts across seven Infant Toddler Program regions. Because school districts are independent entities, the Infant Toddler Program has to develop and manage individual local agreements each year. The Infant Toddler Program has good working relationships with the vast majority of school districts. However, we continue to encounter challenges with school districts that choose not to collaborate in the Part C to Part B transition process. This makes it very difficult for Infant Toddler Program service coordinators to complete required and timely transition activities, and uncomfortable for families with children transitioning into the Part B system.

Several regions faced continued difficulties with these school districts in scheduling and holding the Transition Conference within the required Part C timelines. These regions continue to struggle balancing the timeliness requirement and having Part B representation at the conference. Part B representatives in these areas have indicated that they want to hold the transition conference closer to the child's third birthday (usually 30-60 days prior) to meet their Part B requirements. Specifically, they have requested one meeting that encompasses the Part C Transition Conference, Part B Eligibility Determination, and sometimes Individualized Education Program (IEP) development. This creates an awkward situation between our service coordinators, school district staff, and parents. Infant Toddler 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 Part B representative within the required timeframe, without burdening families. In FFY 2015, 22 of the 105 transition conferences were held later than 90 days prior to the child's third birthday. However, all 22 transition conferences for the reporting period did take place.

In addition, the Infant Toddler Program continues to face challenges with service coordinator turnover resulting in new staff and contractors who are not yet familiar with the Part C requirements. New service coordinators require extensive training with a high level of coaching and monitoring, which puts an additional strain on our already taxed professional development system. Additionally, a few state staff service coordinators have ongoing performance issues. These issues are being addressed by their respective supervisors, but employee performance correction can be lengthy and arduous.

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 data analyst pulled a random file sample comprising 15 files per region from ITPKIDS web-based data system within the full FFY 2015 reporting year -(July 1, 2015 - June 30, 2016).

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 2015 reporting year.
2. The Part C Coordinator sent each region instructions and the list of child names to complete the file review 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 the findings of the file review.

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

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

In FFY 2015, the Infant Toddler Program completed the following activities to address the transition conference challenges:

- Created a new Crystal Report for local programs to more easily track transition conferences held prior to the child's 3rd birthday.
- The Part C Coordinator worked with the Part B Coordinator to determine if one standardized Interagency Agreement (IAG) could be developed between Part C and Part B that clearly identified responsibilities and timelines, versus maintaining approximately 136 local agreements. Unfortunately, because each school district is an independent district, we were informed by the Part B Coordinator that a global IAG is not legally feasible.
- The Part C Coordinator collaborated with the Part B Coordinator regarding the continued transition challenges. The Part B Coordinator provided training and technical assistance to school districts, however, it remains up to each school district to adhere to Part C and Part B Transition requirements. Additionally, the Part B Coordinator does not have any jurisdiction over each independent school district.
- Central Office and regional hub leaders provided training to Infant Toddler Program Service Coordinators regarding the Part C Transition timelines and requirements.
- Meetings were held with local Infant Toddler Program hub leaders and special education directors in the most challenging school districts to the clarify roles and responsibilities of each program and facilitate collaboration.

While we are confident progress is being made with Infant Toddler Program service coordinators, challenges still remain with a handful of school districts. As a result, the Infant Toddler Program will take the following actions to address the remaining challenges:

- Ensure Infant Toddler Program service coordinators understand the Part C Transition Conference must be held at least 90 days, and a the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months prior to the child's third birthday.
- Ensure Infant Toddler Program service coordinators understand they must invite a school district representative to the transition conference. However, service coordinators must understand they must meet the required timeline in IDEA, Part C even if the school districts request a later date, or is known that the school district will not attend the transition meeting.
- Ensure Infant Toddler Program service coordinators collaborate with their local Part B 3-5 early childhood special education teachers to discuss Part C and Part B transition requirements to ensure understanding at both levels.
- Finalize updated Part C and Part B Interagency Agreement, Joint Policy, and Local Protocols in 2017.
- Part C and Part B Coordinators plan to provide statewide training to key Infant Toddler and school staff members on the updated agreement and policies.
- Develop a one page "placemat" for Part C service coordinators and local Part B staff that clearly defines each lead agency's transition responsibilities.
- Conduct monthly to quarterly reviews of transition conference data for all Infant Toddler Program regions.
- Develop a transition conference Crystal Report for central office, hub leaders, and supervisors to track required transition timelines.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Not applicable.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

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	3	null	1

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Idaho demonstrated that it corrected all findings of non-compliance identified in FFY 2014, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, Idaho reports verification that the EIS programs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of data subsequently collected through onsite 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 file sample reviews completed (later than June 30, 2015 and generated from ITPKIDS web-based data system) showed all transition conferences for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool were held with the approval from the family 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 FFY 2014 file sample reviews (also housed in ITPKIDS) showed that their transition conference for 10 children was held later than 90 days prior to their third birthday. However, the transition conference for all ten children did take place prior to their third birthday. In addition, the regions with identified noncompliance included the following strategies in their corrective action plan:

- Review and standardize transition processes across the Hub.

- Continue to review procedures and policies with the intent to identify needs and provide a consistent transition process.

- Conduct monthly review of Crystal Report "Critical Dates by Service Coordinator."

- Conduct monthly sample review of IFSPs for transition meetings.

- Provide status review, by month, at the Regional Hub Leadership Meeting.

- Ensure that continued consistent transition goal processes are provided across the Hub that include transition conference meetings.

- Ensure transition meetings continue to take place prior to age 2 years 9 months.

- Ensure all IFSPs meet the standard related to transition goals.

- Develop checklists and tracking systems to assist with planning transition by 2 years 3 months.

- Print Crystal Reports on 1st of month and email reminders to Service Coordinators to check their worklists..

- Provide policy from e-Manual and discuss timelines at monthly Service Coordinator meeting. Provide crystal report/critical dates and planning for upcoming transition meetings. Discuss barriers and possible solutions to meeting transition timelines. Discuss clear expectation for Service Coordinators to bring to supervisor any issues/difficulties with School Districts or reasons timelines cannot be met.

- Fill vacancies for Service Coordination, Developmental Specialist, and Office Support.

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

Correction of each individual incidence of noncompliance is verified through ITPKIDS. ITPKIDS captures the Transition Conference date for all children enrolled in the Infant Toddler Program and corresponding Continuing Service Report notes completed by service coordinators documenting the transition conference.

Central Office reviews the results from the transition file review using ITPKIDS to verify that each individual instance of non-compliance is corrected unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, the family declined to participate in the transition conference, or the EIS program was unable to make contact with the family.

FFY 2014 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

One region continues to work on correcting FFY 2014 non-compliance. A corrective action plan was developed by the region and approved by Central Office to address and correct non-compliance. The corrective action plan includes strategies that will be taken to ensure correction. Additionally, a required evidence of change section includes the data required to correct prong 1 and prong 2 non-compliance.

The following actions were taken as a result of failure to correct non-compliance within a year of identification:

- Two more required evidence of change statements were added to the corrective action plan that require additional data to demonstrate and verify correction.

- A corrective action plan strategy was modified, specifying monthly instead of quarterly technical assistance calls with Central Office.

- A new strategy was added to the corrective action plan for the Central Office Part C Coordinator to provide trainings on the transition requirements, the importance of these requirements, and their impact on families and the program.

- State staff personnel issues regarding timely transition conferences will be addressed in the employees' performance evaluations.

Central Office will continue to work with the region to ensure correction occurs as soon as possible. If necessary, new corrective action plan strategies and evidence of change statements will be identified to further facilitate the correction process.

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	2014
Target ≥											
Data											

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	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 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1 Mediations held	n	null

FFY 2015 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0	0			

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

Idaho did not receive any mediation requests in FFY 2015.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Not applicable.

Idaho did not receive any mediation requests in FFY 2015.

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	2015
Target		56.50%	56.50%
Data	56.50%	58.10%	

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	56.50%	59.00%	60.00%

Key:

Description of Measure

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See Phase I and II attachments.

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.

See phase I attachment.

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.

See phase I attachment.

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

See phase I attachment.

Description

See phase I attachment.

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.

See phase I attachment.

Theory of Action

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

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

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

Infrastructure Development

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

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

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

Evaluation

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

Technical Assistance and Support

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

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. Armstron

Title: Director

Email: Richard.Armstrong@dhw.idaho.gov

Phone: 208-334-5500