

ID Part C

FFY2016 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

Executive Summary:

Overall, the FFY 2016 Annual Performance reporting period was a respectable year for the Idaho Infant Toddler Program in regards to data performance.

Time and resources continue to be dedicated to implementing and evaluating SSIP strategies outlined in the implementation plan for phase III to ensure results are being achieved. However, taking this project on without any additional resources continues to be a challenge at the state and local level.

Several regions faced new and continued challenges in state and contractor turnover of service coordinators and service providers. These regions struggled with the timeliness requirements for initiating services and completing the IFSP within the 45 day timeline. Please refer to indicators #1, 8A and 8C for more detailed information.

The Infant Toddler Program is currently working with Medicaid to develop an Early, Periodic, Diagnostic, and Treatment (EPSDT) Early Intervention State Plan Amendment. This amendment would align Medicaid benefits with Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). If approved by Medicaid and passed by the Idaho Legislature, the Program would implement billing for these benefits in July of 2018. Idaho plans to use increased receipts from this new funding source to augment hourly rates of pay for contracted service coordination providers. We hope that this will assist the state in reducing turnover of staff which will lead to improved timeliness of transition activities.

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 Infant Toddler Coordinating Council and other stakeholders.
- 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 Council 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). Reports are generated in Central Office and data is transferred to the RAPR. The Lead
1/30/2018 Page 2 of 41

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 utilizes results from the ECO Family Outcomes Survey-Revised as part of the identification of issues and areas for improvement.

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 or 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 are aggregated and analyzed. The ECO Family Outcomes Survey-Revised results and child outcomes data also inform the SPP/APR.

Enforcement, Including Sanctions

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

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- Reporting data to the public.
- Using results of the program's self-assessment 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:
 - Systemic non-compliance or low performance and resulting corrective actions required. These may be identified through review of web-based data, program self-assessment, 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 end 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.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

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 2015 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 2015 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(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 2015 APR in 2017, is available.

Idaho will post results on the performance of all seven regions and the state for the FFY 2016 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, 2018 for any member of the public to access as we submit the FFY 2016 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.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Attachments

| File Name | Uploaded By | Uploaded Date |
|---------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| No APR attachments found. | | |

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 1: Timely provision of services**

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Family Service Plans (IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

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

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% |

| FFY | 2015 |
|--------|--------|
| Target | 100% |
| Data | 93.08% |

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 1886 | 2296 | 93.08% | 100% | 88.98% |

Reasons for Slippage

The same two regions identified in the FFY 2015 APR continued to encounter challenges with providing services to children in a timely fashion due to contractor turnover in FFY 2106, thus affecting the overall state-level data. These two regions comprise the West Hub, the most urban area in Idaho with the highest number of children being served in the state.

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. Over the past two years, these regions have experienced close to 40% turnover in contractors. As of September 2017, one of the regions became fully staffed. Recent FFY 2017 data for this region shows vast improvement in providing early intervention services in a timely fashion.

However, the second region with the largest number of children being served in the entire state continues to encounter high rates of contractor turnover and challenges in filling vacancies. As a result, 72% percent of the 253 children with untimely delivery of services in FFY 2016 occurred in this region. Many of the challenges in recruiting and retaining contractors remain the same and include but are not limited to:

- The West Hub community has many more, and more lucrative employment opportunities for therapists.
- The majority of contractors are only willing to work 10-16 hours per week for the Infant Toddler Program as they also work in private clinics, hospitals, and school districts.
- Stagnant contractor rates that are lower than the market rate.
- 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 earn more 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.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The West Hub direct service hub leader has continuously been working on filling the vacant contracted positions in each region. During these vacancies, the West Hub leader has been thoughtful and intentional in allocating resources to maximize coverage. She continues to use her small cadre of state staff therapists to cover harder-to-fill areas instead of utilizing contractors.

A year and a half ago, 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. The goal was to have state staff physical therapists, occupational therapists, and speech language pathologists in each of the seven regions. Since initiation, the Program has worked rigorously to recruit and hire therapists in each area. However, due to higher private sector wages, only a few have been hired.

The Infant Toddler Program is currently working with Medicaid to develop an Early, Periodic, Diagnosis, and Treatment (EPSDT) Early Intervention State Plan Amendment. This amendment would align Medicaid benefits with Part C of the Individual with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). If approved by Medicaid and passed by the Idaho Legislature, the Program would implement billing for these benefits in July of 2018.

| | |
|--|-----|
| <p>Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>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.</i></p> | 157 |
|--|-----|

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

In Idaho, the criteria for timely receipt of early intervention services is defined as the actual start date being equal to or less than the projected start date for any new service initiated in an IFSP within the FFY 2016 year.

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).

The full FFY 2016 reporting year - July 1, 2016 - June 30, 2017.

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

A statewide report encompassing all new services projected to start in FFY 2016 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 bi-annual 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 and central office staff run reports quarterly and annually to analyze the reasons.

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.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

* 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.

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 fifty-seven (157) 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 date

Statewide, two hundred and fifty-three (253) 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 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

| 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 | 0 | 1 |

FFY 2015 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 2015. Consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02, Idaho reports verification that one of the two EIS programs with noncompliance in FFY 2015 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 2015 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, 2016) 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 services identified in IFSPs were provided, although late, for all 153 children reported as delayed in FFY 2015, 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.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Central Office staff generate and review timely service reports using 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 2015 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

One region continues to work on correcting FFY 2015 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 to vacated contractor positions. Please refer to the "Reasons for Slippage" section in this indicator for additional information.

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 73.3% with their most recent data report showing 87%. Both Central Office and the region feel confident that full compliance will be achieved.

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.

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 the one ongoing instance of non-compliance (in FFY 2016) that was identified in FFY 2014, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, Idaho reports verification that the one EIS program 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) has 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 the ITPKIDS web-based data system) showed that all services were provided in a timely manner for the one EIS program with noncompliance.

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 service reports using 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 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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% |

| FFY | 2015 |
|----------|--------|
| Target ≥ | 95.50% |
| Data | 99.90% |

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|----------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target ≥ | 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 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 in this area.
- This information was then presented to the leadership team during a quarterly Hub Leadership meeting. During this meeting, current resources, the increase in enrollment, and the new SSIP requirements were discussed, as well as how to effectively maintain/improve the SPP Performance Indicators. Using the information from this discussion, draft targets were identified for each SPP indicator to take forward to the Early Childhood Coordinating Council.
- The Early Childhood Coordinating Council's Infant Toddler Program sub-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 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 7/12/2017 | Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings | 1,890 | |
| SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 7/12/2017 | Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs | 1,892 | |

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

| 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 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 1,890 | 1,892 | 99.90% | 95.70% | 99.89% |

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

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

Historical Data

| | Baseline Year | FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 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% |

| | FFY | 2015 |
|----|----------|--------|
| A1 | Target ≥ | 61.00% |
| | Data | 56.65% |
| A2 | Target ≥ | 56.00% |
| | Data | 55.70% |
| B1 | Target ≥ | 64.80% |
| | Data | 60.43% |
| B2 | Target ≥ | 50.80% |
| | Data | 47.95% |
| C1 | Target ≥ | 70.60% |
| | Data | 65.75% |
| C2 | Target ≥ | 58.60% |
| | Data | 58.28% |

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|-------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target A1 ≥ | 61.50% | 63.00% | 65.00% |
| Target A2 ≥ | 56.50% | 57.00% | 57.50% |
| Target B1 ≥ | 65.20% | 65.60% | 67.20% |
| Target B2 ≥ | 51.20% | 51.60% | 52.00% |
| Target C1 ≥ | 71.00% | 71.40% | 71.80% |
| Target C2 ≥ | 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

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

point for the new FFY 2013-2018 targets.

- Central Office staff presented the previous SPP indicator targets and actual data to identify a potential starting point for the new FFY 2013-2018 targets, along with the above observations, to the leadership team during a quarterly Hub Leadership meeting. During this meeting, current resources, the increase in enrollment, and the new SSIP requirements were discussed, as well as how to effectively maintain/improve the SPP Performance Indicators. Using the information from this discussion, draft targets were identified for each SPP indicator to take forward to the Infant Toddler Program Committee and the Early Childhood Coordinating Council.
- 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 2016 SPP/APR Data

| | |
|--|---------|
| Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed | 1261.00 |
|--|---------|

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

| | Number of Children | Percentage of Children |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 11.00 | 0.87% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 367.00 | 29.10% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 176.00 | 13.96% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 345.00 | 27.36% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 362.00 | 28.71% |

| | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 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 $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$. | 521.00 | 899.00 | 56.65% | 61.50% | 57.95% |
| 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 $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$. | 707.00 | 1261.00 | 55.70% | 56.50% | 56.07% |

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 | 12.00 | 0.95% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 408.00 | 32.36% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 258.00 | 20.46% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 404.00 | 32.04% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 179.00 | 14.20% |

| | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 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 $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$. | 662.00 | 1082.00 | 60.43% | 65.20% | 61.18% |
| 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 $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$. | 583.00 | 1261.00 | 47.95% | 51.20% | 46.23% |

Reasons for B2 Slippage

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Idaho encountered challenges meeting the target for indicator 3B2. Continued work on the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III will provide opportunity to implement targeted activities/strategies to ensure necessary trainings, modifications, and improvements occur at local and state levels to improve early childhood outcomes for the infants and toddlers we serve. While Idaho's SiMR is to improve social emotional outcomes for children, trainings for SSIP demonstration sites were completed on the overall Early Childhood Outcomes process including tools, resources, family involvement, ratings, etc. These trainings should have an overall impact on all of the outcomes to ensure they are being completed accurately. Based on the results, Idaho may need to modify baseline and/or targets with stakeholder input in the future.

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 | 15.00 | 1.19% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 338.00 | 26.80% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 195.00 | 15.46% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 486.00 | 38.54% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 227.00 | 18.00% |

| | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 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 $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$. | 681.00 | 1034.00 | 65.75% | 71.00% | 65.86% |
| 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 $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$. | 713.00 | 1261.00 | 58.28% | 59.00% | 56.54% |

Reasons for C2 Slippage

Idaho encountered challenges meeting the target for indicator 3C2. Continued work on the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III will provide opportunity to implement targeted activities/strategies to ensure necessary trainings, modifications, and improvements occur at local and state levels to improve early childhood outcomes for the infants and toddlers we serve. While Idaho's SiMR is to improve social emotional outcomes for children, trainings for SSIP demonstration sites were completed on the overall Early Childhood Outcomes process including tools, resources, family involvement, ratings, etc. These trainings should have an overall impact on all of the outcomes to ensure they are being completed accurately. Based on the results, Idaho may need to modify baseline and/or targets with stakeholder input in the future.

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

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

Please note that this data about the number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program is optional in this FFY16 submission. It will be required in the FFY17 submission.

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? Yes

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

Child outcome data is required to be collected for all children who receive early intervention services in our program for six months or longer. At each interval, a Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF) must be completed. Additionally, an ECO Anchor Assessment from a state approved list must be completed prior to completing the COSF for Entry and Exit. Staff/contractors have the following instruments to assist with the ECO process:

- * Early Childhood Outcomes brochure for families
- * Decision Tree for Summary Rating Discussion document
- * Crosswalks to assessment tools
- * Child Outcomes Summary Form
- * Child Outcomes Summary Form Instructions document

Members of the child's team gather information for the entry and exit ECO process. The team then uses the information to identify a rating for each of the outcomes. Ratings information gathered from the ECO process is recorded in the COSF. The COSF is attached in the program's data system (ITPKIDS), and the outcome ratings, along with the exit progress questions are recorded in ITPKIDS. Several Crystal Reports have been developed for central office and hub leaders to track and report COS data.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4: Family Involvement**

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Historical Data

| | Baseline Year | FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 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% |

| | FFY | 2015 |
|---|----------|--------|
| A | Target ≥ | 92.93% |
| | Data | 92.93% |
| B | Target ≥ | 92.68% |
| | Data | 92.68% |
| C | Target ≥ | 90.98% |
| | Data | 90.98% |

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

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, 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. The response was 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

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 the leadership team during a quarterly Hub Leadership meeting to identify a proposed FFY 2015 baseline and a potential starting point for the new FFY 2016-2018 targets. 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 the 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 updated family survey process and the resources necessary to implement the new process.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

| | | |
|---|--------|---------|
| Number of families to whom surveys were distributed | | 1553.00 |
| Number of respondent families participating in Part C | 14.68% | 228.00 |
| A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | | 210.00 |
| A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | | 228.00 |
| 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 | | 212.00 |
| B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | | 228.00 |
| 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 | | 212.00 |
| C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn | | 228.00 |

| | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|--|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 92.93% | 92.93% | 92.11% |
| B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | 92.68% | 92.68% | 92.98% |
| C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn | 90.98% | 90.98% | 92.98% |

Reasons for A Slippage

Idaho's family survey process has gone through several changes over the past few years. As a result, we are not overly concerned by the .82% decrease between FFY 2015 and FFY 2016. Additionally, more recent data (from July 1, 2017 - October 31, 2017) shows 97% (4.89% increase) for this family outcome.

With a 14.7% return rate in FFY 2016, we are working hard to increase our survey response rates for the families we serve.

Was sampling used? No

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

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

Idaho 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.

This indicator represents 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.

As a result of the challenges encountered in FFY 2015, the Program decided service coordinators would no longer offer paper surveys to families as an option. A service coordinators' role would only be to present the invitation for participation in the electronic survey via text messages or email, and the importance of feedback for program improvement. If families want to complete a hard copy of the survey, they are instructed to contact central office to handle their request. By making this change, ITP eliminated all local level challenges associated with completion and submission of hard copy surveys. The Family Survey Process guidance document in the ITP eManual was updated to reflect changes made to the survey process. Using the train-the-trainer model, hub leaders were trained in person, with subsequent regional service coordinator trainings. Additionally, the central office research analyst followed up with a phone call to hub leaders to ensure understanding of the new process and benefits. The modified family survey process was implemented on August 15, 2016.

Families complete the survey using a link to "Key Survey", an online tool used by the Department to create and manage surveys and other documents, or by requesting a hard copy of the survey from central office. 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).

Based on implementation of the modified family survey process, Idaho used results from August 15, 2016 through June 30, 2017 to report data for FFY 2016. The response rates by regions for that time period ranged from 7.1% to 33.5%, for an overall percentage of 14.7% statewide. The surveys were available in English and Spanish. Sampling was not used in the distribution process as the family for every child with a 6 month IFSP review between August 15, 2016 and June 30, 2017 was offered participation in the family survey. In total, 228 valid, completed surveys were received.

The demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.

Yes

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 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% |

| FFY | 2015 |
|----------|-------|
| Target ≥ | 1.68% |
| Data | 1.66% |

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target ≥ | 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 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 7/12/2017 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs | 313 | null |

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

| Source | Date | Description | Data | Overwrite Data |
|--|-----------|---|--------|----------------|
| U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2016 | 6/22/2017 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 | 22,986 | null |
| TBD | | | null | |

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

| Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|--|---|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 313 | 22,986 | 1.66% | 1.70% | 1.36% |

Reasons for Slippage

Idaho's snapshot birth to one enrollment varied throughout the year with a low of 313 (1.36%) on December 1, 2016 to a high of 374 (1.62%) in September 1, 2017. Idaho continues to have strong relationships with NICUs to ensure children born with medical conditions are referred directly to the program. However, some physicians have been referring exclusively to Home Health programs when newborns are being discharged. Some of the Home Health programs will refer the children to the Infant Toddler Program. However, in most cases the child is over one year of age. The Program is working with local Home Health programs to ensure their understanding of Part C services and that young children can be served by both programs at the same time. Additionally, the Infant Toddler Program Regional Early Childhood Committees have been doing outreach to physician's offices and child care providers to increase program awareness and potential referrals.

Compare your results to the national data

Idaho is a state that does not serve "at risk" children. Idaho's identification of infants from birth to one for FFY 2016 compares to national data as follows:

- Idaho placed 2nd in the nation when ranked among other states with Category C (established by the ITC Data Committee, 2017) eligibility criteria (obtained from the Infant Toddler Coordinators Association.)
- Idaho served 1.36% of its state's infants age birth to one years of age. This figure is .12% above the national average of 1.24% for all 50 states, D.C., and P.R.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 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% |

| FFY | 2015 |
|----------|-------|
| Target ≥ | 2.78% |
| Data | 2.85% |

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target ≥ | 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.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data | Overwrite Data |
|--|-----------|--|--------|----------------|
| SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 7/12/2017 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs | 1,892 | |
| U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2016 | 6/22/2017 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 | 69,016 | |
| TBD | | | null | |

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

| Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|--|---|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 1,892 | 69,016 | 2.85% | 2.81% | 2.74% |

Compare your results to the national data

Idaho is a state that does not serve "at risk" children. Idaho's identification of infants from birth to one for FFY 2016 compares to national data as follows:

- Idaho placed 6th in the nation when ranked among other states with Category C (established by the ITC Data Committee, 2017) eligibility criteria (obtained from the Infant Toddler Coordinators Association.)
- Idaho served 2.74% of its state's infants age birth to one years of age. This figure is .38% below the national average of 3.12% for all 50 states, D.C., and P.R.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Idaho's snapshot birth to three enrollment varied throughout the year with a low of 1,892 (2.74%) in December of 2016 to a high of 2,017 (2.92%) in December of 2017. Additionally, Idaho's cumulative birth to three enrollment continues to climb; from 3,718 (2015-2016 child count data) to 3,802 (2016-2017 child count data). The cumulative child count for 7/1/17 - 11/30/17 is already at 2,859, with seven months left in the federal fiscal year. In light of this data, Idaho's December 1 snapshot count (1,892) does not reflect the continued growth in the number of children being served by the Idaho Infant Toddler Program.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 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% |

| FFY | 2015 |
|--------|--------|
| Target | 100% |
| Data | 97.68% |

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|--|--|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 406 | 548 | 97.68% | 100% | 93.61% |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>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.</i> | 107 |
|--|-----|

Reasons for Slippage

26 of the 35 delayed IFSPs due to agency reasons were in two of seven Idaho regions. These regions experienced turnover in service coordinators during FFY 2016.

In one of these regions, two state staff (the only state staff service coordinators in that region) resigned and moved on to higher paid employment. Due to full contractor caseloads, the hub leader assumed a caseload of over 100 children, thus resulting in reduced performance. Both vacant state staff positions have recently been filled. However, with hiring and training processes, it will take at least two to three quarters in FFY 2017 to see improved performance.

The second region experienced state staff and contractor turnover in service coordinators. Three state staff resigned/retired and two contractors resigned. All staff and contractor positions have recently been filled. However, with hiring and training processes, it will take at least two to three quarters in FFY 2017 to see improved performance.

The Infant Toddler Program is currently working with Medicaid to develop an Early, Periodic, Diagnostic, and Treatment (EPSDT) Early Intervention State Plan Amendment. This amendment would align Medicaid benefits with Part C of the Individual with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). If approved by Medicaid and passed by the Idaho Legislature, the Program would implement billing for these benefits in July of 2018.

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 4/1/2017 through 6/30/2017.

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

Idaho has a number of methods to ensure compliance with 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 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.

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 seven (107) children experienced delays in IFSPs due to exceptional family/extenuating circumstances as defined by IDEA Part C. Examples of exceptional family circumstances include:

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

Statewide, thirty-five (35) 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 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

| 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 | 0 | 0 |

FFY 2015 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 2015, consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, Idaho reports verification that the one program with non-compliance in FFY 2015: (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) has corrected each individual case of non-compliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the program.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

For prong 1 correction, subsequent data (later than June 30, 2016) from ITPKIDS (Idaho's web-based data system) showed that all IFSPs were completed in a timely manner.

For prong 2 correction, data from ITPKIDS showed that IFSPs were created, although late, for all 11 children reported delayed in FFY 2015, 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.

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

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

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 referral date and initial IFSP date. It also calculates the 45 day timeline based on the referral date for service coordinators to track. If the initial IFSP date is greater than 45 days from the referral date, ITPKIDS requires users to record a delay reason before they can save the the IFSP.

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 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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 State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (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% |

| FFY | 2015 |
|--------|--------|
| Target | 100% |
| Data | 98.10% |

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

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

- Yes
- No

| Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services | Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 97 | 105 | 98.10% | 100% | 92.38% |

| | |
|--|---|
| Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>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.</i> | 0 |
|--|---|

Reasons for Slippage

Idaho encountered unanticipated turnover in contracted and state staff service coordinators in FFY 2016. During this period of time, caseloads for remaining service coordinators were much higher than normal and case management hub supervisors with full-time jobs took on service coordination caseloads. Additionally, when new service coordinators are hired, it takes several months for them to be trained and learn the requirements of IDEA, Part C. Idaho recently became fully staffed in January of 2018.

Idaho's Part C Coordinator provided trainings to all service coordinators in each region regarding IDEA, Part C transition requirements and timelines towards the end of FFY 2016. Additionally, training will be provided by the Part C and Part B Coordinators in 2018 to Infant Toddler Program and State Department of Education staff regarding the newly updated transition agreement, policies and procedures, and local protocol.

The Infant Toddler Program is currently working with Medicaid to develop an Early, Periodic, Diagnostic, and Treatment (EPSDT) Early Intervention State Plan Amendment. This amendment would align Medicaid benefits with Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). If approved by Medicaid and passed by the Idaho Legislature, the Program would implement billing for these benefits in July of 2018. Idaho plans to use increased receipt collection from this new funding source to augment hourly rates of pay for

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

contracted service coordination providers. We hope that this will assist the state in reducing turnover of staff which will lead to improved timeliness of transition activities.

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, the Central Office data analyst pulled a random file sample comprising 15 files per region from ITPKIDS web-based data system within the full FFY 2016 reporting year (July 1, 2016 - June 30, 2017).

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 2016 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 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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

FFY 2015 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 2015, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, Idaho reports verification that the EIS programs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2015: (1) are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through onsite monitoring or a State data system; and (2) have corrected each individual case of 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, 2016 and generated from the 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 2015 file sample reviews (also contained in ITPKIDS) showed that 2 children were missing transition steps and services in their IFSP. These two 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 provided staff and contractors with refresher training on transition policies, timelines, and worklist in the ITPKIDS web-based data system with local programs to ensure a full understanding of the requirements and timelines for this indicator. Additionally, Idaho's Part C

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

C Coordinator provided trainings to all service coordinators in each region regarding IDEA, Part C transition requirements and timelines towards the end of FFY 2016.

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 two children identified without transition steps and services in their IFSP in FFY 2015 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, local programs revisited 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. As part of the corrective action process, regions 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.

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (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% |

| FFY | 2015 |
|--------|--------|
| Target | 100% |
| Data | 99.05% |

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|--|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 99 | 104 | 99.05% | 100% | 95.19% |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>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.</p> | 0 |
|---|---|

Reasons for Slippage

The Infant Toddler Program implemented a centralized SEA/LEA Notification process many years ago to assure consistent and timely SEA/LEA notifications. However, in FFY 16 the program identified an issue in the current process regarding timely notification specific to late referrals. To address this issue, a new Crystal Report using data from our web-based data system (ITPKIDS) and process have been developed to target the tracking of late referrals. The new report and process will allow Idaho to ensure timely SEA/LEA Notification for all children, including late referrals.

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.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 2016 reporting year -(July 1, 2016 - June 30, 2017).

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 2016 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)

Idaho demonstrated that it corrected the one instance of a late SEA/LEA notification prior to issuing a finding of non-compliance consistent with requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02.

Specifically, Idaho reports verification of the EIS program with one instance of a late SEA/LEA notification in FFY 2015 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of subsequent data collected through the State data system, and has corrected the individual instance of the late SEA/LEA notification.

For prong 1 correction, a subsequent file sample review completed (later than June 30, 2016 and generated from ITPKIDS web-based data system) showed all SEA/LEA notifications for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool were sent at least 90 days prior to the child's third birthday.

For prong 2 correction, data from the FFY 2015 file sample reviews (also housed in ITPKIDS) showed the SEA/LEA notifications for the one child, although late, was sent prior to the child's third birthday.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

| 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 |

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (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% |

| FFY | 2015 |
|--------|--------|
| Target | 100% |
| Data | 79.05% |

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|--|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 76 | 104 | 79.05% | 100% | 85.58% |

| | |
|---|----|
| Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference <i>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.</i> | 0 |
| Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>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.</i> | 13 |

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 2016 reporting year -(July 1, 2016 - June 30, 2017).

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 2016 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 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 5 | 5 | null | 0 |

FFY 2015 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 2015, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, Idaho reports verification that the EIS programs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2015: (1) are 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, 2016 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 2015 file sample reviews (also housed in ITPKIDS) showed that the transition conference for 22 children, although late, was held prior to their third birthday.

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. Additionally, Idaho's Part C Coordinator provided trainings to all service coordinators in each region regarding IDEA, Part C transition requirements and timelines towards the end of FFY 2016.

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 and late reason, if applicable, 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 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 the one ongoing instance of non-compliance (in FFY 2016) that was identified in FFY 2014, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, Idaho reports verification that the one EIS program 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) has 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 the 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 the transition conference for the 10 children, although late, were held prior to their third birthday.

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 and late reason, if applicable, 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 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions**

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures under section 615 of the IDEA are adopted).

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

This indicator is not applicable.

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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 | | | | | | | | | | | |

| FFY | 2015 |
|----------|------|
| Target ≥ | |
| Data | |

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 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 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/1/2017 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | n | null |
| SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/1/2017 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | n | null |
| SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/1/2017 | 2.1 Mediations held | n | null |

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|---------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 100% |

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Idaho did not receive any mediation requests in FFY 2016.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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 | 2016 |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | | 56.50% | 56.50% | 56.50% |
| Data | 56.50% | 58.10% | 55.90% | |

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2017 | 2018 |
|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | 59.00% | 60.00% |

Key:

Description of Measure

See Phase I and II attachments

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.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in EIS programs and/or EIS providers to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and other early learning initiatives, such as Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge and the Home Visiting program and describe the extent that these new initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

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

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Analyses and must be a child- or family-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increase the rate of growth in infants and toddlers demonstrating positive social-emotional skills) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increase the percentage reported under child outcome B under Indicator 3 of the SPP/APR (knowledge and skills) and increase the percentage trend reported for families under Indicator 4 (helping their child develop and learn)).

Statement

Description

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

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

Theory of Action

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

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

 Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Infrastructure Development

- 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.
- 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.
- Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- 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

- 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.
- 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.
- 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

- 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.
- Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- 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).
- 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.

Phase III submissions should include:

- Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
- Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
- Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SiMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SiMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SiMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SiMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SiMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SiMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SiMR in relation to targets

F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

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

Selected: Lead Agency Director

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

Name: Russell S. Barron

Title: Director, Department of Health and Welfare

Email: Russell.Barron@dhw.idaho.gov

Phone: 208-334-5500