

# ID Part C

# FFY2017 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

**Executive Summary:**

Overall, the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2017 Annual Performance reporting period was a good year for the Idaho Infant Toddler Program (ITP) with regard to data performance. While we made progress in several indicators, we faced ongoing challenges due to turnover in service coordinators and service providers (both state staff and contractors), which compounded the influence of limited resources.

In state fiscal year 2018, ITP experienced a 25% separation rate for service coordinators.

- State employees - 21%
- Contractors - 29%

In state fiscal year 2018, ITP experienced a 15% separation rate for direct service providers.

- State employees - 8%
- Contractors - 19%

Substantial time and resources at all levels were committed to the development and implementation of a new Early, Periodic, Diagnostic, and Treatment (EPSDT) Early Intervention State Plan Amendment to align Medicaid benefits with Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Overall, implementation has gone as smoothly as it could based on the scope and significance of the project. There have been some challenges with data, billing, and payment systems/claim processing, making it difficult to forecast consistent receipt revenue. As a result, we have not yet been able to increase contractor rates and add contractors to decrease caseload size. We anticipate being able to make forward movement on this towards the end of FFY 2018.

Time and resources continue to be dedicated to implementing and evaluating State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) strategies outlined in the implementation plan for Phase III. However, with the many other projects and initiatives completed in FFY 2017 and limited resources, implementation of the SSIP continues to present a sizable challenge at both the state and local level.

**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

## **FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

collected child enrollment, demographic, and 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 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

**FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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:

- 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.

## FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- Mentorship and reflective supervision with statewide mentors and Dathan Rush and M'Lisa Shelden.

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

### Professional Development System:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.

**FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

for addressing pre-service and in-service training needs. National professional organizations and their Idaho chapters or affiliates assist in implementing the Part C Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD).

Idaho has a Consortium for the Preparation of Early Childhood Professionals made up of faculty from each institution of higher education in the state, and representatives from various early childhood agencies and professional organizations. The Consortium facilitates coordination of university programs for the Early Childhood/Early Childhood Special Education Blended Certificate and articulation from two-year to four-year programs. The Consortium assists the Lead Agency in the review of transcripts to determine fully-qualified candidates and to prepare academic plans for professions under conditional hiring agreements. Additionally, the Consortium partners with the Department of Health and Welfare to coordinate internship placements and to promote training in evidence-based practices in pre-service programs.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

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

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

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

- The Central Office Infant Toddler Program staff identified the need for stakeholder input regarding the new SPP indicator targets. Staff met to review the previous SPP indicator targets and actual data to identify a potential starting point for the new FFY 2013-2018 targets. Central Office staff presented their findings to the leadership team during a quarterly Hub Leadership meeting. During this meeting, current resources, the increase in enrollment, and the new SSIP requirements were discussed, as well as how to effectively maintain/improve the SPP Performance Indicators. Using the information from this discussion, draft targets were identified for each SPP indicator to take forward first to the EC3's Infant Toddler Program Committee and then to the full Early Childhood Coordinating Council.
  1. **Indicator #2** - Idaho has made steady progress during the previous Federal Fiscal Years to ensure services are being provided in a child's natural environment. Additionally, Idaho has strong policies and procedures in place and has developed contract language to ensure continued progress.
  2. **Indicator #3** - Idaho has met few targets in the previous Federal Fiscal Year for this indicator. We believe the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) will have a positive long-term impact in this area.
  3. **Indicator #4** - A new baseline and targets were set in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR. The new baseline was set using the 2nd and 3rd quarters' data and new targets were set based on continued efforts to solidify the new family survey process. Realistic gains are expected to be made by FFY 2018. Refer to Indicator #4 for additional information.
  4. **Indicators #5 and #6** - During the previous Federal Fiscal Years for these indicators, Idaho remained fairly steady, until the 2008 recession. As a result, the state put measures in place to increase the number of birth-to-one-year-olds and birth-to-three-year-olds being served, with great success. We anticipate making slow and steady progress, but know this is a potential area of concern due to the program's resource capacity.
  5. **Indicator #9** - Not applicable for Idaho Part C.
  6. **Indicator #10** - Idaho has not received any mediation requests during the previous Federal Fiscal Years.
  7. **Indicator #11** - Idaho will submit the baseline and SPP targets when submitting Indicator #11 in April of 2017.
- The Early Childhood Coordinating Council's Infant Toddler Program Committee met to review and discuss the proposed targets identified during the Hub Leadership meeting. Committee members asked whether the SSIP would impact the current level of performance for any indicators. There may be some impact on performance, but we want to move forward and do our best to continue to make slow and steady progress. The Infant Toddler Program Committee accepted the newly proposed targets and recommended we present them to the full Early Childhood Coordinating Council for review and approval.
- The Infant Toddler Program Committee, along with the Part C Coordinator, presented information on previous targets and actual data, along with the FFY 2013 - 2018 SPP targets, to the Early Childhood Coordinating Council, with a rationale for how the new targets were identified. Council members fully approved the new targets, especially in light of the program's current resource capacity and additional work required to complete the SSIP to improve child outcome results.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

**Reporting to the Public:**

**FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2016 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 2016 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 2016 APR in 2018, is available.

Idaho will post results on the performance of all seven regions and the state for the FFY 2017 SPP/APR on the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare's Idaho Infant Toddler Program website ([www.infanttoddler.idaho.gov](http://www.infanttoddler.idaho.gov)) no later than February 1, 2018 for any member of the public to access as we submit the FFY 2017 SPP/APR to OSEP. Additionally, the results will be reviewed and shared through other forums such as meetings with the hub and regional supervisors, program managers, and Infant Toddler Coordinating Council.

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

**FFY 2017 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	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	93.08%	88.98%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
2111	2455	88.98%	100%	93.08%

<p><b>Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances</b>  <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>	174
--	-----

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 2017 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 2017 reporting year - July 1, 2017 - June 30, 2018.

**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 2017 was generated from the ITPKIDS web-based data system.

Idaho uses several methods to ensure the accuracy of timely service data, including:

- Hub leaders use Crystal Reports on a weekly-to-monthly basis to identify any missing or inaccurate data.
- Standardized bi-annual QA review is conducted in each region ensuring that data and continuing service reports recorded in ITPKIDS match documents uploaded in ITPKIDS.

**FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

- 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
- 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 analyze reports quarterly and annually to determine causes.

Necessary modifications are made in ITPKIDS when inaccuracies are identified. Infant Toddler Program central office staff and data analyst work together to identify 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, 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 and contractors.
- In-person, phone, or email communication with hub leaders identifying data areas to be addressed and necessary follow up.
- ITPKIDS business team discusses potential modifications to the system to prevent future issues.

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 seventy-three (174) 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, one hundred and seventy-one (170) children experienced a delay in timely services due to an agency reason. Examples of agency reasons include:

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

**Actions required in FFY 2016 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 2016**

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

**FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

## FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

*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 2016, consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, Idaho reports verification that the sole program with non-compliance in FFY 2016: (1) has corrected each individual case of non-compliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the program; and (2) 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.

For Prong 1, data from ITPKIDS showed that services identified in IFSPs were provided, although late, for all 253 children reported as delayed in FFY 2016, 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.

For Prong 2 correction, subsequent data (later than June 30, 2017) from ITPKIDS (Idaho's web-based data system) showed that all services were provided in a timely manner for the EI program.

*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 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 the single ongoing instance of non-compliance (in FFY 2017) that was identified in FFY 2015, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, Idaho reports verification that the single EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2015: (1) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program; and (2) 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.

For Prong 1 correction, data from ITPKIDS showed that the 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.

For Prong 2 correction, subsequent file sample reviews completed (later than June 30, 2016 and generated from the ITPKIDS web-based data system) showed that all services were provided in a timely manner for the sole EIS program with noncompliance.

*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 2017 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	2016
Target ≥	95.50%	95.70%
Data	99.90%	99.89%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	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 made steady progress during the previous Federal Fiscal Years to ensure services are being provided in a child's natural environment. Additionally, Idaho has strong policies and procedures in place and has developed contract language to ensure continued success in this area.
- This information was then presented to the leadership team during a triannual Statewide 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 Statewide Leadership meeting. Committee members asked whether the SSIP would impact the current level of performance for any indicators. It was reported that 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 sub-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 sub-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 full 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 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/11/2018	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings</a>	2,040	
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/11/2018	<a href="#">Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs</a>	2,044	

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
2,040	2,044	99.89%	95.90%	99.80%

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**FFY 2017 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	2016
A1	Target ≥	61.00%	61.50%
	Data	56.65%	57.95%
A2	Target ≥	56.00%	56.50%
	Data	56.07%	55.70%
B1	Target ≥	64.80%	65.20%
	Data	60.43%	61.18%
B2	Target ≥	50.80%	51.20%
	Data	47.95%	46.23%
C1	Target ≥	70.60%	71.00%
	Data	65.75%	65.86%
C2	Target ≥	58.60%	59.00%
	Data	58.28%	56.54%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	63.00%	65.00%
Target A2 ≥	57.00%	57.50%
Target B1 ≥	65.60%	67.20%
Target B2 ≥	51.60%	52.00%
Target C1 ≥	71.40%	71.80%
Target C2 ≥	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 2017 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 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	1321.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	12.00	0.91%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	458.00	34.67%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	169.00	12.79%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	348.00	26.34%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	334.00	25.28%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 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 $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$ .	517.00	987.00	57.95%	63.00%	52.38%
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 $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$ .	682.00	1321.00	56.07%	57.00%	51.63%

**Reasons for A1 Slippage**

During the data and infrastructure analysis phase of the SSIP, Idaho learned that our providers were inconsistently using the ECO process, tools, and resources to determine ECO ratings. Clearly, our program needed a more consistent process to ensure that standardized ECO processes, tools, and resources are used and implemented to gain a higher level of confidence in the consistency and accuracy of the state's ECO data.

In addition, Idaho learned that among the local leadership and providers there existed varying comprehension of the ECO process. Staff/contractors viewed development through a domain-specific lens in determining the three child outcomes areas while considering the child's broader development and functioning. They overlooked the importance of using information on functional behaviors and use of behaviors in a meaningful way. Staff/contractors continue to be challenged in acquiring and implementing this knowledge in their practice. Leadership continues to provide support and opportunities for practicing these skills.

Since the need was identified, Idaho has been focusing on improving and standardizing the Early Childhood Outcomes process, tools, and resources. We've completed an ECO pilot in three of the seven regions in our state. We've gathered feedback and are working to collate the pilot data. We will use that data to create and implement final ECO action plans in the pilot sites, followed by the development of plans in the remaining regions for statewide scale-up.

While we did not initiate the ECO pilot during FFY 2017, pre-pilot discussions and SSIP activities created focus on the ECOs beginning with the inclusion of ECO data at Statewide Leadership meetings in FFY 2015. Leadership in the regions has consistently been exposed to ECO data, patterns, and trends, and have shared the data with their staff. This data sharing has prompted more scrutiny and

**FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

awareness of the ECO process and available tools and resources throughout the state. Regions not involved in the pilot have been closely following its progress and are eager for scale-up to occur. We believe that the focus on ECOs has led to increased reflection on tools and processes and that the result will be more accurate and reliable ECO data.

Our 2018 analysis of Part C FFY 2016 SPP/APR national data trends has shown us that other states are experiencing the same downward trends in child outcomes that we have seen in Idaho. Anecdotal data from our pilot project indicates that variable child outcome ratings may have been caused by inconsistent use of the decision tree and some confusion around the age-anchoring process. Hence, Idaho may need to identify new baseline and targets in the next few years. Following statewide scale-up, and with sufficient time for children to receive entry and exit ECO ratings, we anticipate that standardized tools and processes will reduce the fluctuation of ECO data. This will enable Idaho to accurately choose achievable targets and, through increased monitoring and assessment of data, improve child outcomes over the next several years.

**Reasons for A2 Slippage**

Same as A1

**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	10.00	0.76%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	480.00	36.34%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	269.00	20.36%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	381.00	28.84%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	181.00	13.70%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 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 $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$ .	650.00	1140.00	61.18%	65.60%	57.02%
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 $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$ .	562.00	1321.00	46.23%	51.60%	42.54%

**Reasons for B1 Slippage**

Same as A1

**Reasons for B2 Slippage**

Same as A1

**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	8.00	0.61%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	369.00	27.93%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	211.00	15.97%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	468.00	35.43%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	265.00	20.06%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 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 $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$ .	679.00	1056.00	65.86%	71.40%	64.30%
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 $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$ .	733.00	1321.00	56.54%	59.40%	55.49%

**Reasons for C1 Slippage**

Same as A1

**Reasons for C2 Slippage**

**FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Same as A1

**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	1821
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.	661

*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 2016 response**

none

**FFY 2017 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	2016
A	Target ≥	92.93%	92.93%
	Data	92.93%	92.11%
B	Target ≥	92.68%	92.68%
	Data	92.68%	92.98%
C	Target ≥	90.98%	90.98%
	Data	90.98%	92.98%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	93.00%	94.00%
Target B ≥	93.00%	94.00%
Target C ≥	92.00%	93.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

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

- Central Office Infant Toddler Program reviewed the previous SPP indicator targets and actual data to identify a potential starting point for the new FFY 2013 - 2018 targets. The following observations were made:
  - **Indicator #4** - Idaho 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 triannual Statewide 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 sub-committee of 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 Statewide 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 sub-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 sub-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 full 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

**FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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 triannual Statewide 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.
- The Part C Coordinator and data manager presented information on both the previous and the new family survey tools and processes, 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 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Number of families to whom surveys were distributed		1889.00
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	15.88%	300.00
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights		284.00
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights		300.00
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		283.00
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs		300.00
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		286.00
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn		300.00

	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	92.11%	93.00%	94.67%
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	92.98%	93.00%	94.33%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	92.98%	92.00%	95.33%

**Was sampling used?** No

**Was a collection tool used?** Yes

**Is it a new or revised collection tool?** No

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

Yes

**FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
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 summarization 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.

Service coordinators provide an invitation to complete the family survey electronically via text messages or email, and provide families with information on the importance of obtaining feedback to assist with program improvement. If families want to complete a hard copy of the survey, they are instructed to contact central office to handle their request.

Families complete the survey using a link to "Key Survey", an online tool used by the Department of Health and Welfare 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, providing anonymity and 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).

Idaho used results from July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018 to report data for FFY 2017. The response rates by regions for that time period ranged from 9.9% to 30.9%, for an overall percentage of 15.9% statewide. The surveys are 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 July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018 was offered participation in the family survey. In total, 300 valid, complete surveys were received.

Idaho continues to work on increasing the number of surveys completed by families to ensure appropriate demographic representation in our state. While our response rate has improved, it is still well below the national average. As a result, ITP is currently working with our hub leaders and Infant Toddler Coordinating Council to develop a modified survey distribution process. The initial proposal includes centralizing the process such that one person in central office would be responsible for sending out texts or emails to families with the survey link and their child's ID number at the time of their child's 6-month IFSP review. If a family does not submit a survey within a specified time frame, they would be phoned with an offer to have their responses collected on the spot. Our goal is to have a new survey distribution process finalized and implemented in FFY 19.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**FFY 2017 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	2016
Target ≥	1.68%	1.70%
Data	1.66%	1.36%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	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 triannual Statewide 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 sub-committee and the full 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 Statewide 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 sub-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 sub-committee, along with the Part C Coordinator, presented information on previous targets and actual data, along with the newly proposed targets, to the full 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 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/11/2018	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs</a>	344	null

## FFY 2017 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, 2017	6/12/2018	<a href="#">Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1</a>	22,911	null

### FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
344	22,911	1.36%	1.73%	1.50%

### 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 2017 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, 2018) eligibility criteria (obtained from the Infant Toddler Coordinator's Association).
- Idaho served 1.50% of the state's infants age birth to one year of age. This figure is .25% above the national average of 1.25% for all 50 states, D.C., and P.R.

### Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 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	2016
Target ≥	2.78%	2.81%
Data	2.85%	2.74%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	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 triannual Statewide 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 sub-committee and the full 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 Statewide 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 sub-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 sub-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 full 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 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/11/2018	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs</a>	2,044	

## FFY 2017 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, 2017	6/12/2018	<a href="#">Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3</a>	70,091	

### FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
2,044	70,091	2.74%	2.85%	2.92%

### 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 three for FFY 2017 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, 2018) eligibility criteria (obtained from the Infant Toddler Coordinator's Association).
- Idaho served 2.92% of the state's infants age birth to three years of age. This figure is .34% below the national average of 3.26% for all 50 states, D.C., and P.R.

### Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 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	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	97.68%	93.61%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
1,505	2,037	93.61%	100%	94.45%

<p><b>Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances</b>  <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></p>	419
---	-----

**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 2017 reporting year - July 1, 2017 - June 30, 2018.

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

Timely Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs) are calculated based on the actual number of days between the date of referral and the date of the child's initial Individualized Family Service Plan meeting. In Idaho, the 45-day clock to complete the initial Individualized Family Service Plan begins the date a referral is received. A statewide report encompassing all initial Individualized Family Service Plans completed on 7/1/17 through 6/30/2018 was generated from ITPKIDS.

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

- Monthly reports run by hub leaders 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 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.

**FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

- Reports run by Infant Toddler Program data analyst and hub leaders 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 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 triannual Statewide 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 percentage of children receiving timely services.

Statewide, four hundred and nineteen (419) children experienced delays in IFSPs 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, one hundred and thirteen (113) children experienced delays 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 2016 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 2016**

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 2016 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 2016, consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, Idaho reports verification that two programs with non-compliance in FFY 2016: (1) have corrected each individual case of non-compliance, unless the child is no longer in the jurisdiction of the program; and (2) 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.

For Prong 1, data from ITPKIDS showed that IFSPs were created, although late, for all 35 children reported delayed in FFY 2016, unless

**FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

the child was no longer in the jurisdiction of the EIS program, the parent declined to move forward with the IFSP process, or the EIS program was unable to contact the family.

For Prong 2 correction, subsequent data (later than June 30, 2017) from ITPKIDS (Idaho's web-based data system) showed all IFSPs were completed in a timely manner.

Correction of each incidence of non-compliance is verified through ITPKIDS. ITPKIDS captures the Referral Date and the Initial IFSP date for every child. If the Initial IFSP Date is greater than 45 days from the Referral Date, ITPKIDS requires users to input a delay reason in order to save the 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, and Corrective Action Plan processes, 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 to move forward with the IFSP process, or the EIS program was unable to contact the family.

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

Correction of each individual incidence of non-compliance is verified through ITPKIDS. ITPKIDS captures the referral date and 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 IFSP.

Central Office staff generate and review timely services reports (using the data from ITPKIDS described above) during the annual R-APR, SPP/APR, and Corrective Action Plan processes, 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 2017 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	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	98.10%	92.38%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
97	105	92.38%	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
--	---

**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 2017 reporting year (July 1, 2017 - June 30, 2018).

**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 2017 reporting year.

**FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

2. The Part C Coordinator sent instructions and the list of child names to each region 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 continued to face contractor and state staff turnover in FFY 2017. Additionally, caseloads for service coordinators are very high with some variation across the state.

The Infant Toddler Program successfully developed and implemented new Medicaid Early Intervention Early, Periodic, Diagnostic, and Treatment (EPSDT) benefits in July of 2018. However, it has taken longer than anticipated to work through data, billing, and payment systems issues to process claims. This had made it difficult to forecast consistent receipt revenue. As a result, we have not yet been able to increase contractor rates and add more contractors to decrease caseload size. We anticipate being able to make forward movement on this towards the end of FFY 2018.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 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 2016**

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 2016 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 2016, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, Idaho reports verification that the EIS programs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016: (1) have corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program; and (2) 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.

For Prong 1 correction, data from the FFY 2016 file sample reviews (also contained in ITPKIDS) showed that 8 children were missing transition steps and services in their IFSP. These eight 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.

For Prong 2 correction, subsequent file sample reviews (completed later than June 30, 2017 and generated from the ITPKIDS web-based data system) showed all IFSPs were developed with transition steps and services at least 90 days prior, and, at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months prior to the child's third birthday.

ITP local programs revisited transition policies, timelines, and worklist in the ITPKIDS web-based data system with their new and existing staff/contractors to ensure a full understanding of the requirement and timeline for this indicator. Additionally, Idaho's Part C Coordinator worked with the Part B Coordinator to develop an online training video that covers the transition requirements and timelines for local staff/contractors.

*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 eight children identified without transition steps and services in their IFSP in FFY 2016 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 with new and existing staff/contractors 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 required IFSP transition steps and services. Additionally, Idaho's Part C Coordinator worked with the Part B Coordinator to develop an online training video that covers the transition requirements and timelines and all local staff/contractors were required to review it.

**FFY 2017 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	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	99.05%	95.19%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
102	105	95.19%	100%	97.14%

<p><b>Number of parents who opted out</b> 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
---	---

**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 2017 reporting year.
2. The Part C Coordinator sent each region instructions and the list of client names to complete the file review for indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C.
3. Hub leaders completed the reviews and submitted the results to the Part C Coordinator.
4. The Part C Coordinator reviewed/verified the findings, clarified any questions, and calculated the results.

# FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 (2017) ? reporting year -(July 1, 2017 - June 30, 2018).

## 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 2017 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 5 instances of late SEA/LEA notifications prior to issuing a finding of non-compliance consistent with requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02.

Specifically, Idaho reports verification that the EIS programs with 5 instances of a late SEA/LEA notification in FFY 2016 are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of subsequent data collected through the State data system, and have corrected the individual instances of the late SEA/LEA notification.

For prong 1 correction, a subsequent file review completed (later than June 30, 2017 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 FFY 2016 file reviews (also housed in ITPKIDS) showed the SEA/LEA notifications for the 5 children, although late, was sent prior to the child's third birthday.

## Actions required in FFY 2016 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 2016

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 2017 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	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	79.05%	85.58%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
87	105	85.58%	100%	92.38%

<b>Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference</b> <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
<b>Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances</b> <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>	10

**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 2017 reporting year (July 1, 2017 - June 30, 2018).

## FFY 2017 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 2017 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 2016 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 2016

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

### FFY 2016 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 2016, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, Idaho verifies that the EIS programs with non-compliance identified in FFY 2016: (1) have corrected each individual case of non-compliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program; and (2) 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.

For Prong 1 correction, data from the FFY 2016 file sample reviews (also housed in ITPKIDS) showed that the transition conference for 15 children, although late, was held prior to their third birthday.

For Prong 2 correction, subsequent file sample reviews (completed later than June 30, 2017 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 prior, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months prior to the child's third birthday.

ITP local programs revisited transition policies, timelines, and worklist in the ITPKIDS web-based data system with their staff/contractors to ensure a full understanding of the requirement and timeline for this indicator. Additionally, Idaho's Part C Coordinator worked with the Part B Coordinator to develop an online training video that covers the transition requirements and timelines for local staff/contractors. This video is available statewide on demand to Part B and Part C staff and contractors.

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 2017 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, as described above.

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

**FFY 2017 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	2016
Target ≥		
Data		

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	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 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	<a href="#">2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	<a href="#">2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	<a href="#">2.1 Mediations held</a>	n	null

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
0	0	0			

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**FFY 2017 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	2017
Target		56.50%	56.50%	56.50%	59.00%
Data	56.50%	58.10%	55.90%	58.20%	

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

**FFY 2018 Target**

FFY	2018
Target	60.00%

Key:

**Description of Measure**

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

**Overview**

**Data Analysis**

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

**Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity**

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

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

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

## FFY 2017 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 2017 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: Dave Jeppesen

Title: Director

Email: Dave.Jeppesen@dhw.idaho.gov

Phone: 208-334-5500