

# STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART C

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

For reporting on  
FFY 2019

Florida



**PART C DUE**  
**February 1, 2021**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

## Introduction

### Instructions

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

### Intro - Indicator Data

#### Executive Summary

The Florida Department of Health (FDOH) is the lead agency for Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in Florida. Within FDOH, the Division of Children's Medical Services (CMS), Bureau of Early Steps and Newborn Screening is responsible for the program oversight, which includes, but is not limited to: the development and implementation of the state policies that are consistent with Part C of IDEA regulations, state law and agency policies and procedures; oversight of the dispute resolution system; programmatic and contract monitoring of Local Early Steps Programs (LES); continuous improvement process; local determinations process; public reporting; development and implementation of statewide personnel standards; a professional development system; federal reporting; federal grant management; and fiscal oversight and accountability.

On March 1, 2020, Florida officially reported its first COVID-19 cases. In response, Florida's State Surgeon General declared a Public Health Emergency, determining that COVID-19 was a threat to public health in the state of Florida. The Surgeon General renewed that declaration on April 30, 2020, June 29, 2020, August 28, 2020, and October 23, 2020 as COVID-19 continued to pose a threat to public health.

On March 9, 2020, Florida's Governor issued an Executive Order declaring a State of Emergency for COVID-19. Florida's public schools were temporarily closed beginning in March 2020 and then later closed for the remainder of the 2020 spring semester, through June 2020. In addition, all mandated school testing was cancelled. On April 1, 2020, Florida's Governor issued a statewide stay-at-home order, requiring all persons in Florida to limit movements and personal interactions outside of the home to only those necessary to obtain or provide essential services or conduct essential activities.

Florida's Governor created a phased plan for Florida's recovery, titled Plan for Florida's Recovery (<https://floridahealthcovid19.gov/plan-for-floridas-recovery/>). Phase 1 of the Plan took effect May 4, 2020 and was updated May 11, 14, and 15, 2020. Phase 2 of the Plan took effect June 5, 2020, for all Florida counties except Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach. Phase 3 of the Plan took effect September 25, 2020, for all Florida counties.

The Early Steps State Office conducted targeted and specific outreach to each LES Program to inquire about their operational status and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. These outreach efforts examined and focused on the following:

- Active positive COVID-19 cases
- Comparison in referrals pre-Covid-19
- Individualized Family Support Plan updates
- In-person or telehealth/virtual meetings
- Overall COVID-19 status in service regions
  - Updates on Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) and access
  - Impacts on travel
- School district relationship status
- Future plans during and post the pandemic

Based on the data gathered and collected from these program interviews, the Early Steps State Office developed COVID-19 guidance, that was made available on-line, with public access. The website included essential information about resources, and federal and state guidance. Frequently asked questions were also developed and maintained on the website for the LES Programs or provider reference.

The Early Steps State Office implemented system enhancements to the existing program data system to monitor and track services related to the COVID-19 health pandemic. The data system has been updated (and will continue to be updated as necessary) to include barrier and suspension codes that will allow the LES Program to document delays in services related to the impact of COVID-19 for recipients and providers. The system enhancements will also allow for documentation of delay in services due to COVID-19, monitoring of the use of telehealth services. During the initial phases of these enhancements, weekly analysis of barrier codes was conducted. This information was used to assess the ongoing impact of COVID-19 on the program and the success of the recent telehealth services. All programs and providers received training on how to use the new COVID-19 related barrier and suspension codes. Local Early Steps Programs and providers continue to request individualized training, as necessary, from the state office.

#### Additional information related to data collection and reporting

The Early Steps Program is administered throughout the state in 15 geographic regions through contracts with 14 organizations. Local Early Steps Programs are the contracted entities that evaluate and assess all referred infants and toddlers. The LES Programs determine eligibility and provide direct early intervention services for eligible infants and toddlers by working with internal and community service providers, and other community resources.

The Early Steps Program maintains a statewide interagency coordinating council, the Florida Interagency Coordinating Council for Infants and Toddlers (FICCIT). Per Part C of IDEA federal regulation 34 CFR § 303.604, the role of FICCIT is to advise and assist Florida's Early Steps Program in the performance of its responsibilities.

The Early Steps State Office comprises a Program Administrator, who is the designated Part C Coordinator; two unit supervisors; programmatic staff, who provide program consultation for local Early Steps programs; budgetary and contract management staff; data analysts; and additional resources within FDOH, as needed.

#### 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.**

Florida's General Supervision System

The FDOH Bureau of Early Steps and Newborn Screening within the Division of Children's Medical Services is responsible for the general supervision system. The Early Steps State Office carries out the following general supervision activities in accordance with Part C of IDEA federal regulations, state law and agency policies and procedures: development and oversight of a state performance plan and annual performance report; policies and procedures for effective IDEA implementation; programmatic monitoring activities, including strategies for improvement and corrective actions, a local determinations process, public reporting and contracting, desk and on-site monitoring of all 15 LES Programs; a fiscal management system; a data system to gather data on processes and results; an effective dispute resolution system, including mediation, state complaints and due process hearings;

technical assistance related to the implementation of the IDEA, statewide personnel standards and professional development, coordination and oversight of the FICCT.

#### Geographic Regions

The Early Steps Program is administered throughout the state in 15 geographic regions through contracts with 14 organizations. Local Early Steps Programs are the contracted entities that evaluate and assess all referred infants and toddlers for determination of eligibility. Local Early Steps Programs provide direct early intervention services for eligible infants and toddlers by working with internal and community service providers, and other community resources.

#### 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.**

##### State Office Technical Assistance Provision

Technical assistance (TA) is provided in response to requests from individual programs or if identified by the Early Steps State Office. Focused TA is provided through statewide policy clarifications via email, conference calls, or webinars and, when necessary, individual local technical calls. TA is related to strategies for meeting federal timelines for evaluations, Individualized Family Support Plan (IFSP) meetings, service delivery, transition planning, implementation of evidence-based practices and ensuring efficient use of resources. Monthly business conference calls with Directors and Coordinators are utilized to provide TA and maintain open and clear statewide communication with LES Programs. The LES Programs are provided a functional directory to contact Early Steps State Office staff for issues the program may have. The Early Steps State Office continues to implement on-going data manager calls, where State data managers provide feedback and in-service training on recent database system changes, how to implement those changes and where or how to submit requests or changes to the data system.

The Early Steps State Office has made efforts in developing a Technical Assistance Framework to assist programs to identify sustainable improvement strategies. Teams have been organized around a continuum of supports, including training, technical assistance, policies, and technology improvements to assist the LESs in improving performance and compliance. The Early Steps State Office will use this framework to also help those programs where compliance is difficult to meet or for those programs who have not corrected noncompliance with specific indicators. TA framework teams' leads for the state office have been established.

##### Technical Assistance Received by The State

The Early Steps State Office requests and utilizes technical assistance from national, state or local content experts on an ongoing basis, and materials created by OSEP-sponsored centers, such as the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA), the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy), and the IDEA Data Center (IDC) are utilized.

Florida has regular contact with previous OSEP lead, Kathleen Heck, and current OSEP lead Susan Kauffman, through email and conference calls. Technical assistance calls with Early Steps State Office staff, Kathleen Heck, Susan Kauffman from OSEP, and ECTA providers Sherry Franklin and Robin Nelson were held monthly throughout the year. Topics discussed during these communications included: Strategies for improvement regarding Accountability, Child Outcomes and Data Integrity.

The Part C Coordinator and applicable state office staff attended the 2020 Improving Data, Improving Outcomes Virtual Conference on October 19-22, 2020. In addition, the Part C Coordinator and lead agency staff, as appropriate, have participated in standing bi-weekly TA calls with staff from TA centers, including ECTA, and DaSy, as well as monthly OSEP calls. TA was provided to the State on a variety of topics, including state general supervision structures, accountability and monitoring, State Systemic Improvement Plan, collection and reporting of IDEA 618 data. Drafts of data reports and narratives for federal reporting have been provided to TA providers for review and input.

Early Steps State Office staff attended the following calls or webinars in FY 19-20: OSEP Part C SPP/APR technical assistance, Use of Tele-Intervention in Early Intervention, Conducting Evaluation and Assessment During the Pandemic, Methodology for State Collection & Tracking of Maintenance of Effort, Equity in Infant and Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation and ongoing ITCA COVID-19 meetings. Information was used from these calls and webinars to strengthen understanding of federal reporting requirements and develop policy and guidance to continue service provision during the public health crisis.

The Quality Assurance, Accountability and Monitoring staff participated in the Effective Strategies for Correcting Longstanding Noncompliance Working Series on October 13, November 4, and November 17, 2020. This series allowed staff to share ideas and strategies for performance improvement. Staff used new strategies to review program data and ensure correction of noncompliance of LES Programs for FFY 2018.

##### New Interactive Robust Data Administration System

Florida continues to enhance the current legacy data system, including adding new codes, removing obsolete codes, and clarifying code definitions, while a new data administration system vendor has been procured, and has begun work on a new interactive data administration system. The procurement was released in mid-2018 and the contract with the vendor for the new and enhanced data system is for five years. Information received from TA providers was very instrumental and used in the preparation for a new, high quality state data system. The State office has hired an additional data staff member, a project manager, and a business analyst for the data project, to allow for more data analysis and expertise, as the new data system work continues.

##### Quality Assurance & Accountability Efforts

Lead agency staff continue to review the monitoring and accountability tools of other states in the peer-to-peer group and working with TA providers to implement methods to increase compliance and performance of LES Programs. Much of the input and edits provided by TA providers related to federal reports were incorporated into the reports prior to submission. State leads have been established to work on revising the manuals as needed. In addition, as a result of the recent TA cohort, that staff were able to participate in, new processes have been implemented surrounding how to analyze, organize and collect data from LES Programs, to ensure that programs have corrected any outstanding noncompliance.

Materials created by ECTA and DaSy are shared and discussed by the state office during on-going technical assistance calls with LES Program directors, including improvement strategies regarding provider enrollment, service delivery and the child outcomes summary process.

#### Professional Development System:

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

The professional development system includes mandatory pre-service training consisting of three orientation modules, service coordinator apprenticeship training, and data system training. The training is in the process of being reviewed, updated and revised, to coincide with policy updates, changes, evidence-based practices and new information.

In-service training includes the Autism Navigator for Early Intervention Providers, a web-based instructional training program; an interactive e-learning community to support use of the Autism Navigator; and a train-the-trainer system for training assessors on the Battelle Developmental Inventory, Second

Edition (BDI-2) assessment.

The Early Steps State Office is working to enhance the professional development infrastructure and increase training opportunities at the state and local level. The Early Steps State Office has hired four new staff to fill vacancies in the professional development unit, to further assist with these efforts.

#### **Stakeholder Involvement:**

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

Interagency Coordinating Council

The Early Steps Program maintains a statewide interagency coordinating council, the Florida Interagency Coordinating Council for Infants and Toddlers (FICCIT). The role of FICCIT is to advise and assist Florida's Early Steps Program in the performance of its responsibilities. FICCIT is comprised of governor appointed members who are representative of the state's population. Members from various fields, such as Early Head Start, the Agency for Health Care Administration, Department of Children and Families, Department of Education, and parents of infants and toddlers with disabilities are represented.

Stakeholder Workgroups

In accordance with Section 391.308(2)(c), Florida Statutes, the Early Steps Program is required to:

Develop a State Plan annually, and ensure the State Plan is developed through an inclusive process that involves families, local programs, health care providers, and other stakeholders.

The Early Steps Program established five workgroups, in partnership with the LES Programs, FICCIT, and other community partners to assist with Early Steps strategic planning for program priorities. Representatives included members of FICCIT, LES Programs, parents, and other state agencies and programs that serve young children and their families. The stakeholder groups provided opportunity for input in the preparation of the Early Steps State Plan. Input has been gathered through face-to-face meetings, webinars and conference calls.

The stakeholder workgroups have also completed ECTA System Frameworks or the DaSy Data System Framework Self-Assessments as tools to record the current status of the state system and set priorities for improvement in each of the areas addressed by the workgroup. The results of these self-assessments have been used to develop action and sub-action steps for planning and implementation. The groups meet throughout the year to monitor progress towards implementation of action steps, review data to determine progress, and provide additional information on achievements or challenges.

Based on progress toward the set priorities for improvement in each workgroup, some workgroups have discussed participating in the framework self-assessments again to re-evaluate goals and objectives. The data stakeholder workgroup, as an example will need to re-evaluate the self-assessment previously completed, to address progress, since the work on implementing a new data administration system has begun.

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

NO

#### **Reporting to the Public:**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2018 performance of each EIS Program located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2018 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2018 APR in 2020, is available.**

Florida reported to the public on the FFY 2018 performance of each LES Program in the state by posting local performance profiles on the Early Steps website on May 26, 2020. This reporting can be found at:

[http://www.cms-kids.com/providers/early\\_steps/reports/program\\_performance.html](http://www.cms-kids.com/providers/early_steps/reports/program_performance.html)

The Early Steps State Office ensures this reporting is updated annually no later than 120 days following the state's submission of the SPP/APR. Also available to the public on this website are the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) submitted February 2020, Florida's Determination Letter, and the State's Annual Report and the State Plan.

#### **Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions**

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

OSEP notes that one or more of the attachments included in the State's FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

The State's IDEA Part C determination for both 2019 and 2020 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2020 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance.

The State must report, with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

#### **Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

## **Intro - OSEP Response**

The State's determinations for both 2019 and 2020 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to sections 616(e)(1) and 642 of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 303.704(a), OSEP's June 23, 2020 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

The State did not provide verification that the attachments submitted, including Indicator 11, in its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission are in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), as required by Section 508.

## **Intro - Required Actions**

# Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

## Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual 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)

### Data Source

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

### Measurement

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

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

### Instructions

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	57.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	86.79%	86.43%	89.03%	88.67%	89.39%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

### FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
259	330	89.39%	100%	90.30%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances**

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

39

**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).**

Florida's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services is as soon as possible, but within 30 calendar days from when the family consented to the service, unless there is documentation of a child or family related issue or natural disaster which caused the delay.

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

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.**

All 15 LES Programs are monitored annually. This year's monitoring utilized a review of child record documentation and data. The monitoring sample was comprised of randomly selected child records based on the local program's size. A total of 330 records were reviewed for this indicator. Exceptional family circumstances included family schedule conflicts, child illness, and unsuccessful attempts to contact the family. Other barriers causing delays in receiving timely services were due to provider availability, appointments not scheduled within the 30-day timeline, and lack of communication between Service Coordinator and Provider causing delays in scheduling.

**If needed, provide additional information about this indicator here.**

While the rate of compliance for Indicator 1 for FY 2019-20 is 90.3%, the compliance rate began to fall below pre-pandemic rates during the months of April and May and was lowest in May 2020. The state did not meet the 100% target for this indicator. The pandemic did not negatively impact timely services. Shortly after the COVID-19 pandemic began, the state Medicaid agency and private insurers began to cover telehealth services for children in Florida's Part C Program. In addition, IDEA, Part C funds were used to fund telehealth services. There was a slight increase in the percentage of services provided in a timely manner during FY 2019-20, over the previous year, which may be attributed to the fact that providers did not need to travel to provide services virtually.

The Early Steps State Office will continue to provide targeted technical assistance to assist LES Programs in process improvements to ensure timely service delivery. This will include reviewing with programs root cause analyses and possibly on-going self-assessments in this indicator for the identified programs

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
9	8	0	1

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

To ensure noncompliant practices have been revised and the local Early Steps programs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, the Early Steps State Office conducted a second round of reviews of child records for each of the nine LES Programs with findings of noncompliance. In May 2020, the Early Steps State Office reviewed updated data through a subsequent sample of 240 records for the nine programs. This was done by reviewing the record for each child's IFSP documents and case notes with service start date information. Three of the nine LES Programs achieved 100% compliance in the subsequent review of the sample of records. In November 2020, another subsequent sample review of 108 records for the 6 LES Programs was conducted. Five of the six LES Programs achieved 100% compliance in this review. Again, this was done by reviewing the record for each child's IFSP document and case notes with service start date information. One LES Program did not achieve 100% compliance.

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

Thirty-seven children in the nine LES Programs did not receive early intervention services in a timely manner. For each individual case of noncompliance, the Early Steps State Office verified that the LES Program initiated services for each of the 37 children, although late. The verification was completed by requiring the LES Programs to provide follow up and reporting with documentation of proof that services were initiated.

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

One of the LES Programs still has a finding of noncompliance. This LES Program continues to work with the Early Steps State Office on program and process improvement strategies and provides updates on a monthly basis. The monthly updates will be required until correction of compliance is achieved.

The Early Steps State Office is continuing efforts in implementing a tiered system of support to assist LES Programs to identify sustainable improvement strategies. The teams are being organized around a continuum of supports, including training, technical assistance, policies, and technology improvements to assist the LES Programs in improving performance and compliance.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2017	3	3	0

**FFY 2017**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

To ensure noncompliant practices have been revised and the LES Programs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, the Early Steps State Office conducted a subsequent review of child records for each of the LES Programs with findings of noncompliance. Data samples were reviewed for the period between March to June 2019 and again in July to December 2019. The Early Steps State Office reviewed an updated sample of 90 records for the three LES Programs for the months of March to May 2020. This was done by reviewing the record for each child's IFSP documents and case notes with service start date information. All three LES Programs achieved 100% compliance in the subsequent review of the sample of records.

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

In the reviews conducted between March and December 2019, 16 children in the three LES Programs did not receive early intervention services in a timely manner. For each individual case of noncompliance, the Early Steps State Office verified that the LES Program initiated services for each of the 16 children, although late. The verification was completed by requiring the LES Programs to provide follow up and reporting with documentation of the proof that services were initiated.

**1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**1 - OSEP Response**

OSEP notes that in the "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018" data field, the State reported ten findings of noncompliance identified. However, in its narrative of how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, the State reported that "three of nine LES programs achieved 100% compliance in the subsequent review of the sample records. Another subsequent sample review of 108 records for the 6 LES Programs was conducted. Five of the six LES Programs achieved 100% compliance in the review. Again, this was done by reviewing the record for each child's IFSP document and case notes with service start date information." Therefore, OSEP is unable to determine the number of findings the State identified and verified as corrected, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 on-site monitoring or a State data system.

**1 - Required Actions**



## Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	45.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target>=	88.00%	89.00%	90.00%	91.00%	92.00%
Data	83.90%	92.56%	92.29%	92.89%	94.11%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target>=	94.11%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2013-2019 Targets were developed with input from the Early Steps Continuous Improvement Workgroup and the Florida Interagency Coordinating Council for Infants and Toddlers.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/08/2020	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	17,279
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/08/2020	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	19,186

### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of Infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
17,279	19,186	94.11%	94.11%	90.06%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Several LES Programs are having difficulty contracting with agencies that will provide services in the natural environment. Each LES Program that did not meet the state's identified target were required to include improvement strategies on the performance improvement plan. The Early Steps State Office will continue to work with these programs on process improvement strategies to increase provider availability in natural environment settings.

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

For Indicator 2, the number of services in community settings was consistent prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, declined slightly in March 2020, and then markedly declined in April, May, and June 2020. The number of services in home settings declined as well; however, not as notable a decline as for community settings. These declines are likely attributable to the overall decrease in the number of children referred and served after the pandemic began. To ensure continuity of services during the pandemic, the state Medicaid agency and private insurers reimbursed providers for virtual early intervention services during the last quarter of FY 2019-20.

The Early Steps State Office is continuing efforts in implementing a tiered system of support to assist programs to identify sustainable improvement strategies. The teams are being organized around a continuum of supports, including training, technical assistance, policies, and technology improvements to assist the LES Programs in improving performance and compliance.

**2 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**2 - OSEP Response**

**2 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

#### Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

##### Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

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

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

##### Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 3 - Indicator Data

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

YES

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Florida Child Outcomes Advisory Committee was formed in 2009 to review baseline data, assist with target setting, explore improvement activities and to problem-solve implementation issues for the Florida Birth to Five Child Outcome Measurement System. The committee includes representation from the State Office, the Department of Education (DOE), the DOE discretionary project for child outcomes, LES Programs, and local school districts. The committee meets as needed to review progress data, effectiveness of implemented improvement strategies, and recommend changes.

FFY 2013-2019 Targets were developed with input from the Early Steps Continuous Improvement Workgroup, the Florida Interagency Coordinating Council for Infants and Toddlers and Child and Family Outcomes Stakeholder Workgroup. The Child and Family Outcomes Workgroup established new business rules in 2019 for reporting as described below.

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

At-risk infants and toddlers

#### Historical Data

Outcome	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A1	2012	Target>=	33.00%	33.50%	35.00%	39.00%	44.00%
A1	31.80%	Data	30.87%	29.07%	29.12%	28.52%	29.75%
A1 AR	2018	Target>=					
A1 AR	0.00%	Data					
A2	2012	Target>=	69.00%	70.00%	72.00%	74.00%	76.00%
A2	68.80%	Data	66.95%	66.09%	67.67%	60.10%	55.00%
A2 AR	2018	Target>=					
A2 AR	100.00%	Data					100.00%
B1	2012	Target>=	56.50%	57.00%	57.50%	58.00%	60.00%
B1	54.20%	Data	53.06%	53.40%	53.18%	53.49%	74.63%
B1 AR	2018	Target>=					
B1 AR	100.00%	Data					100.00%
B2	2012	Target>=	45.00%	46.00%	47.00%	48.00%	50.00%
B2	44.00%	Data	43.48%	41.12%	40.95%	39.00%	50.91%
B2 AR	2018	Target>=					
B2 AR	100.00%	Data					100.00%
C1	2012	Target>=	55.00%	56.00%	57.00%	58.00%	60.00%
C1	54.10%	Data	54.50%	51.36%	52.44%	51.33%	86.75%
C1 AR	2018	Target>=					
C1 AR	100.00%	Data					100.00%
C2	2012	Target>=	69.60%	69.70%	69.80%	69.90%	70.00%
C2	69.40%	Data	68.09%	66.14%	67.60%	64.86%	89.05%
C2 AR	2018	Target>=					
C2 AR	100.00%	Data					100.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2019
Target A1 >=	32.00%
Target A1 AR >=	32.00%
Target A2 >=	69.00%

Target A2 AR >=	69.00%
Target B1 >=	74.60%
Target B1 AR >=	74.60%
Target B2 >=	51.00%
Target B2 AR >=	51.00%
Target C1 >=	86.80%
Target C1 AR >=	86.80%
Target C2 >=	89.10%
Target C2 AR >=	89.10%

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed**

6,274

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

<b>Not including at-risk infants and toddlers</b>	<b>Number of children</b>	<b>Percentage of Total</b>
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	209	3.33%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	2,351	37.47%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	543	8.65%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	358	5.71%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,813	44.84%

<b>Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers</b>	<b>Number of children</b>	<b>Percentage of Total</b>
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1	5.88%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	0	0.00%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1	5.88%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	15	88.24%

<b>Not including at-risk infants and toddlers</b>	<b>Numerator</b>	<b>Denominator</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
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	901	3,461	29.75%	32.00%	26.03%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	3,171	6,274	55.00%	69.00%	50.54%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable**

Florida's statewide slippage is believed to be a result of data quality issues involving collecting and reporting statewide child outcomes data. The COVID-19 pandemic greatly reduced the number of exit assessments conducted in the final quarter of FY 19-20. There was an average of 1,850 less children with completed assessments across the three outcome areas. Early Steps allowed the use of telemedicine as an alternative option for service delivery during the public health emergency; however, the use of the BDI-2 and its design to be used with a child in a face-to-face setting did not lend itself as a usable evaluation tool during this time.

**Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable**

Florida's statewide slippage is believed to be a result of data quality issues involving collecting and reporting statewide child outcomes data. The COVID-19 pandemic greatly reduced the number of exit assessments conducted in the final quarter of FY 19-20. There was an average of 1,850 less children with completed assessments across the three outcome areas. Early Steps allowed the use of telemedicine as an alternative option for service delivery during the public health emergency; however, the use of the BDI-2 and its design to be used with a child in a face-to-face setting did not lend itself as a usable evaluation tool during this time.

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	1	2		32.00%	50.00%	Met Target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	16	17	100.00%	69.00%	94.12%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	41	0.65%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,283	20.45%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,952	31.11%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,870	29.81%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,128	17.98%

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1	5.88%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	0	0.00%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2	11.76%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	14	82.35%

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their	3,822	5,146	74.63%	74.60%	74.27%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program							
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,998	6,274	50.91%	51.00%	47.78%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable**

Florida's statewide slippage is believed to be a result of data quality issues involving collecting and reporting statewide child outcomes data. The COVID-19 pandemic greatly reduced the number of exit assessments conducted in the final quarter of FY 19-20. There was an average of 1,850 less children with completed assessments across the three outcome areas. Early Steps allowed the use of telemedicine as an alternative option for service delivery during the public health emergency; however, the use of the BDI-2 and its design to be used with a child in a face-to-face setting did not lend itself as usable evaluation tool during this time.

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2	3	100.00%	74.60%	66.67%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	16	17	100.00%	51.00%	94.12%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for B1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable**

Florida's statewide slippage is believed to be a result of data quality issues involving collecting and reporting statewide child outcomes data. The COVID-19 pandemic greatly reduced the number of exit assessments conducted in the final quarter of FY 19-20. There was an average of 1,850 less children with completed assessments across the three outcome areas. Early Steps allowed the use of telemedicine as an alternative option for service delivery during the public health emergency; however, the use of the BDI-2 and its design to be used with a child in a face-to-face setting did not lend itself as usable evaluation tool during this time.

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	36	0.57%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	386	6.15%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	352	5.61%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,925	30.68%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,575	56.98%

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1	5.88%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	0	0.00%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	5	29.41%

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	11	64.71%

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,277	2,699	86.75%	86.80%	84.36%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	5,500	6,274	89.05%	89.10%	87.66%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable**

Florida's statewide slippage is believed to be a result of data quality issues involving collecting and reporting statewide child outcomes data. The COVID-19 pandemic greatly reduced the number of exit assessments conducted in the final quarter of FY 19-20. There was an average of 1,850 less children with completed assessments across the three outcome areas. Early Steps allowed the use of telemedicine as an alternative option for service delivery during the public health emergency; however, the use of the BDI-2 and its design to be used with a child in a face-to-face setting did not lend itself as usable evaluation tool during this time.

**Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable**

Florida's statewide slippage is believed to be a result of data quality issues involving collecting and reporting statewide child outcomes data. The COVID-19 pandemic greatly reduced the number of exit assessments conducted in the final quarter of FY 19-20. There was an average of 1,850 less children with completed assessments across the three outcome areas. Early Steps allowed the use of telemedicine as an alternative option for service delivery during the public health emergency; however, the use of the BDI-2 and its design to be used with a child in a face-to-face setting did not lend itself as usable evaluation tool during this time.

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	5	6	100.00%	86.80%	83.33%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	16	17	100.00%	89.10%	94.12%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for C1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable**

Florida's statewide slippage is believed to be a result of data quality issues involving collecting and reporting statewide child outcomes data. The COVID-19 pandemic greatly reduced the number of exit assessments conducted in the final quarter of FY 19-20. There was an average of 1,850 less children with completed assessments across the three outcome areas. Early Steps allowed the use of telemedicine as an alternative option for service delivery during the public health emergency; however, the use of the BDI-2 and its design to be used with a child in a face-to-face setting did not lend itself as usable evaluation tool during this time.

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

Question	Number
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	17,448
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.	5,707



Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

NO

**Provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.”**

A standard score of 78 or above (>-1.5 SD) is considered to represent a level of functioning that is "comparable to same-aged peers."

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

The Early Steps State Office and the Florida Department of Education (DOE) have collaborated to develop an outcome measurement system for children birth to five years of age and have agreed to collect data on children across Part C and Part B on a common instrument, the BDI-2. The BDI-2 is a "standardized, individually administered assessment battery of key developmental skills in children from birth through seven years of age" [Source: Battelle Developmental Inventory – Examiner’s Manual]. In addition to its use as a measure of child outcomes, this instrument may also be used for determination of eligibility for Early Steps. Florida’s child outcomes measurement system uses scores from the Personal-Social domain of the BDI-2 to determine category placement for Indicator 3A, scores from the Cognitive and Communication domains of the BDI-2 to determine category placement for Indicator 3B, and scores from the Adaptive and Motor domains of the BDI-2 to determine category placement for Indicator 3C. The actual target data are derived from assessments administered upon entry into and exit from Early Steps for eligible children in all LES Programs. Local Early Steps Program employees enter results for assessments in the BDI-2 Data Manager online scoring and reporting program. Data are exported from the Data Manager and a de-identified data file, consisting of all records with sufficient data to be included in the state report is sent to the University of Miami, whose staff completes the analyses that produces the category assignments.

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

While Florida’s child outcomes measurement system uses scores from all BDI-2 domains to report child outcomes to the Office of Special Education Programs, prior to FY 19-20, because Florida’s percentage of infants and toddlers who showed substantial progress was below the national average, stakeholders were convened to review Florida’s rules for assignment of progress categories, using the BDI-2 assessment instrument. A comparison was conducted of Florida’s rules and rules of other states that use the BDI-2 for child outcomes measurement. As a result, Florida’s rules were revised to align with the other states that use the BDI-2 to assign progress categories:

The Social Relationships (3A) outcome is reported using the BDI-2 Personal-Social domain.

The Knowledge and Skills (3B) outcome is reported using the BDI-2 Communication or Cognitive domains, considering each domain when determining progress. Previously, only the Communication domain was considered.

The Actions to Meet Needs (3C) outcome is reported using the BDI-2 Adaptive or Motor domains, considering each domain when determining progress. Previously, only the Adaptive domain was considered.

There are four subdomains not administered on the BDI-2 prior to 24 months of age; therefore, for children under 24 months, a raw score of zero was imposed at entry in the following subdomains:

While Florida’s child outcomes measurement system uses scores from all BDI-2 domains to report child outcomes to the Office of Special Education Programs, prior to FY 19-20, because Florida’s percentage of infants and toddlers who showed substantial progress was below the national average, stakeholders were convened to review Florida’s rules for assignment of progress categories, using the BDI-2 assessment instrument. A comparison was conducted of Florida’s rules and rules of other states that use the BDI-2 for child outcomes measurement. As a result, Florida’s rules were revised to align with the other states that use the BDI-2 to assign progress categories:

The Social Relationships (3A) outcome is reported using the BDI-2 Personal-Social domain.

The Knowledge and Skills (3B) outcome is reported using the BDI-2 Communication or Cognitive domains, considering each domain when determining progress. Previously, only the Communication domain was considered.

The Actions to Meet Needs (3C) outcome is reported using the BDI-2 Adaptive or Motor domains, considering each domain when determining progress. Previously, only the Adaptive domain was considered.

There are four subdomains not administered on the BDI-2 prior to 24 months of age; therefore, for children under 24 months, a raw score of zero was imposed at entry in the following subdomains:

- Adaptive – Personal Responsibility
- Personal-Social – Peer Interaction
- Motor – Perceptual Motor
- Cognitive – Reasoning and Academic Skills

The number of children in each of the progress reporting categories are calculated based on application of the following decision rules:

- Progress Category A: Percent of children who did not improve functioning:
- Children who were functioning below a level comparable to same-aged peers at both entry and exit, and children who were functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers at entry, but below their same-aged peers at exit.
- Children that did not show any raw score gains between entry and exit in any of the subdomains that make up the domains used to measure the outcome (which rules out any standard score gain).
- Progress Category B: Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers:
- Children who were functioning below a level comparable to same-aged peers at both entry and exit and showed a gain in their subdomain raw scores but did not reach a scale score of 5 at exit in any of the subdomains for BDI-2 domains used to report an outcome.
- Children who were functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers at entry, but below their same-aged peers at exit, and showed a gain in any subdomain raw score even with a subdomain scaled score of 5 or greater.
- Progress Category C: Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it:
- Children functioning below a level comparable to same-aged peers at both entry and exit.
- Children in this category showed a gain in their subdomain raw scores and either a scaled score of 5 or above in that domain or a DQ score gain for the corresponding domain.
- Progress Category D: Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers :
- This category includes only children who were functioning below a level comparable to same-aged peers on entry, but were functioning comparable to same-age peers at exit.
- Children in this category showed a gain in their domain standard score for any of the domains used to report an outcome.
- Progress Category E: Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers:

- This category includes children who were functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers at both entry and exit for any of the domains used to report an outcome. Although Florida's business rules were revised to align with the other five states that use the BDI-2 to assign progress, continued use of the BDI-2 standardized assessment instrument, even with revised rules for defining progress, did not positively impact the three child outcome areas. From a review of national data, looking at social-emotional development, it appears measurement of social-emotional skills using the Child Outcome Summary (COS) Process, versus only a standardized assessment instrument, such as the BDI-2, results in an increased percentage of children showing improvement and more accurately reflects the infant's or toddler's social-emotional skills. Considering that the items on the BDI-2 assessment do not adequately measure social-emotional skills of very young children and the BDI-2 is a tool designed to more readily evaluate a child in a face-to-face setting, Early Steps has made the decision to transition from the BDI-2 as Florida's only tool to determine a child's entry-exit progress and replace it with the Child Outcome Summary (COS) Process. The COS process allows the integration of multiple sources of information rather than only one standardized tool. This will allow a more accurate assessment, using information gathered across routines, activities, and settings. In addition, it will be easier for LES Programs to complete entry and exit assessments when prevented from conducting such assessments in person.

### **3 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

The State did not provide FFY 2019 target data for A1 and A2. The State must provide the required data next year in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR.

#### **Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

Revised FFY 2019 targets for A1 and A2 are provided.

### **3 - OSEP Response**

The State revised its FFY 2019 targets for A1 and A2 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

### **3 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 4: Family Involvement

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 4 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2005	Target>=	75.50%	76.00%	76.50%	77.00%	77.50%
A	55.90%	Data	83.21%	82.20%	80.54%	83.96%	84.60%
B	2005	Target>=	72.50%	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%	74.50%
B	52.50%	Data	78.55%	79.19%	77.66%	81.17%	81.49%
C	2005	Target>=	87.50%	88.00%	88.50%	89.00%	89.50%
C	57.60%	Data	91.29%	90.95%	92.04%	92.05%	92.26%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target A>=	84.60%
Target B>=	81.49%
Target C>=	92.26%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2013-19 Targets were developed with input from the Early Steps Continuous Improvement Workgroup, the Florida Interagency Coordinating Council for Infants and Toddlers and Child and Family Outcomes Stakeholder Workgroup.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	2,802
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	1,726
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	1,492
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	1,726
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	1,443
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	1,726
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	1,610
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	1,726

Measure	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2)	84.60%	84.60%	86.44%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2)	81.49%	81.49%	83.60%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2)	92.26%	92.26%	93.28%	Met Target	No Slippage

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Question	Yes / No
Was a collection tool used?	YES
If 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.	NO

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

The Early Steps State Office continues to work with the Family Resource Specialists to educate families on the importance of collecting Family Outcomes data and to promote the increase of overall responses for all families enrolled in the Part C program. While the variance between the child count and family survey responses is not statistically significant, the Early Steps State Office is in the process of implementing a new family survey process, and the new survey will be expected to provide a clear method for determining and ensuring representativeness.

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

The family survey responses showed a slight overrepresentation of Asian and Hispanic responses and slight underrepresentation of Black or African American and White responses as compared to the Child Count Settings data. The following chart indicates race/ethnicity as reported in Child Count Settings data versus distribution of race/ethnicity in the survey response data.

Race/Ethnicity.....	Family Survey Responses .....	Child Count FY 2019-20 .....
American Indian or Alaska Native.....	<4%.....	2%.....
Asian.....	3%.....	1.97%.....
Black or African American.....	18%.....	19.82%.....
Hispanic/Latino.....	43%.....	39.61%.....
Multi-racial.....	4%.....	3.46%.....
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander.....	<1%.....	0.09%.....
White.....	32%.....	34.86%.....
Missing .....	<1% .....	Not reported .....

The Early Steps State Office continues to work with the Family Resource Specialists to educate families on the importance of collecting Family Outcomes data and to promote the increase of overall responses for all families enrolled in the Part C program. The Early Steps State Office is in the

process of implementing a new family survey process, and the new survey will be expected to provide a clear method for determining and ensuring representativeness.

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

The National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) survey was utilized as the measurement tool for Indicator 4. All families with children who had an initial IFSP for at least six months and exiting the program between February 1, 2020 and May 1, 2020, were offered the opportunity to submit a survey. The distribution process utilized personal contact with the families by the Service Coordinator, Family Resource Specialist, and providers working with the child and family.

**4 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4 - OSEP Response**

The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was representative of the population. However, in its narrative, the State reported "the family survey responses showed a slight overrepresentation of Asian and Hispanic responses and slight underrepresentation of Black or African American and White responses as compared to the Child Count Settings data." Therefore, OSEP is unclear whether the response group was representative of the population.

**4 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

## 5 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2012	0.71%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	0.72%	0.73%	0.73%	0.74%	0.74%
Data	0.70%	0.69%	0.70%	0.69%	0.71%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	0.74%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2013-2019 Targets were developed with input from the Early Steps Continuous Improvement Workgroup and the Florida Interagency Coordinating Council for Infants and Toddlers.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/08/2020	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	1,925
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/25/2020	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	221,463

### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
1,925	221,463	0.71%	0.74%	0.87%	Met Target	No Slippage

### Compare your results to the national data

Florida's results are higher than the statewide target, but lower than the national average of 1.37%. Florida will continue working on the development of a new data administration system, where referrals will be more uniform, improve the child find monitoring plan and ensure consistent messaging in public awareness materials.

### Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**5 - OSEP Response**

**5 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

## 6 - Indicator Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2012	1.89%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	1.91%	1.91%	1.92%	1.92%	1.93%
Data	2.10%	1.98%	2.17%	2.29%	2.47%

#### Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	2.47%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2013-2019 Targets were developed with input from the Early Steps Continuous Improvement Workgroup and the Florida Interagency Coordinating Council for Infants and Toddlers.

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/08/2020	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	19,186
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/25/2020	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	674,612

#### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
19,186	674,612	2.47%	2.47%	2.84%	Met Target	No Slippage

#### Compare your results to the national data

Florida's results are higher than the statewide target, but lower than the national average of 3.70%. Florida will continue working on the development of a new data administration system, where referrals will be more uniform, improve the child find monitoring plan and ensure consistent messaging in public awareness materials.

#### Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response



## 6 - Required Actions

## Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

#### Instructions

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 7 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	85.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	77.50%	95.36%	96.13%	84.33%	90.30%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

### FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
246	330	90.30%	100%	91.21%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

### Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

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

55

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

26

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.**

All 15 LES Programs are monitored annually. This year's monitoring utilized a review of child record documentation and data. The monitoring sample was comprised of randomly selected child records based on local program size. A total of 330 records were reviewed. Exceptional family circumstances included fifteen programs with family schedule conflicts, five programs with child illness and two programs with unsuccessful attempts to contact the family which caused a delay in scheduling the evaluation and completing the IFSP within the 45-day timeline. Other barriers causing delays in two programs were due to provider availability which caused evaluation appointments to not be scheduled within the 45-day timeline and in six programs internal issues involving high service coordinator caseloads, delays in communication which impeded the completing of required activities from initial contact through the eligibility evaluation. State staff manually reviewed each randomly selected file to determine if an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

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

While the rate of compliance with Indicator 7 for FY 2019-20 is 91.2%, the rate of compliance with 45-day timeline decreased after the COVID-19 pandemic began, reaching its lowest rate in April 2020. Although the state did not meet the 100% target for indicator 7, the pandemic did not negatively impact the overall indicator compliance rate, as there was a slight increase in compliance over the previous year. Shortly after the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, the state Medicaid agency began to reimburse providers for evaluations conducted virtually, which was critical in helping to ensure initial evaluations could be conducted and IFSPs developed within 45 days of referral.

A key factor impacting performance was LES Programs provider capacity. A few LES Programs did not have adequate staff available to schedule initial evaluations with a multidisciplinary team within the 45-day timeline. This resulted in evaluations being scheduled late. The Early Steps State Office will continue to monitor and require recruitment of adequate number trained providers.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

To ensure noncompliant practices have been revised and the LES Programs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, the Early Steps State Office conducted a second review of child records for each of the five LES Programs with findings of noncompliance. The data was from the months of July through December 2019. The Early Steps State Office reviewed updated data through a subsequent sample of 140 records for the five programs. This was done by reviewing the referral and IFSP dates in the data system and verifying the information with the referral form and IFSP documents provided by the LES Programs.

One of the five LES Programs achieved 100% compliance in the subsequent review of the sample of records. A second subsequent sample review of 79 records for the four LES Programs was conducted for February and March 2020. All the four programs achieved 100% compliance in the review. Again, this was done by reviewing the referral and IFSP dates in the data system and verifying the information with the referral form and IFSP documents provided by the LES Programs

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

Thirty-two children did not receive an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. For each individual case of noncompliance, the Early Steps State Office verified that the LES Program conducted the evaluation and assessment and individualized Family Support Plan (IFSP) for each child, although late. The verification was based on follow up reporting and reviews by the LES Program with documentation of individual children whose evaluation and assessment and initial IFSP had not been completed.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2017	2	2	0

**FFY 2017**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

To ensure noncompliant practices have been revised and the LES Programs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, the Early Steps State Office conducted subsequent reviews of child records for each LES Program with findings of noncompliance, data samples were reviewed for the period between March to June 2019 and again in July to December 2019. The Early Steps State Office reviewed an updated sample of 30 records for the two LES Programs for the months of March to May 2020. Both LES Programs achieved 100% compliance based upon a subsequent review of records. The record reviews verified correction of noncompliance of two LES Programs with findings of noncompliance identified in FY 2017. This was done by reviewing the referral and IFSP dates in the data system and verifying the information with the referral form and IFSP documents provided by the LES Programs.

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

In the reviewed sample of records between March to December 2019, seven children did not receive an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. For each individual case of noncompliance, the Early Steps State Office verified that the LES Program conducted the evaluation and assessment and individualized Family Support Plan (IFSP) for each child, although late. The verification was based on follow up reporting and reviews by the LES Program with documentation of individual children whose evaluation and assessment and initial IFSP had not been completed.

**7 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**7 - OSEP Response**

The State did not provide the reasons for delay, as required by the measurement table. Therefore, OSEP was unable to determine whether the State reviewed the reasons for delay.

**7 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8A - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	64.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	90.71%	93.57%	93.23%	91.00%	95.45%

**Targets**

FFY	2019
Target	100%

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
281	330	95.45%	100%	92.73%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

A key factor impacting performance was service coordinator error in scheduling timely conferences. The LES Program staff did track the due date in a timely manner which resulted in the transition conferences being late. High volume caseloads also impacted some service coordinators' performance. The Early Steps State Office will continue to monitor and ensure adequate training is conducted and that best practices for transition are being followed. There was a 2.72 percent decrease in the percentage of 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 from FFY 2018 to FFY 2019. This slippage can be attributed to higher service coordinator caseloads in several local programs which attributed to a delay in scheduling timely transition conferences with families as well as an increase in service coordinator error in tracking when transition conferences were due. This caused a delay in the development of the IFSP with transition steps and services being developed at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday.

**Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances**

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

25

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

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.**

All 15 LES Programs are monitored annually. This year's monitoring utilized a review of child record documentation and data. The monitoring sample was comprised of randomly selected child records based on local program size. A total of 330 records were reviewed. Exceptional family circumstances included eleven programs with family schedule conflicts, one program with child illness and two programs with unsuccessful attempts to contact the family. An additional reason for delay in eight programs was service coordinator error in scheduling timely transition conferences with the family. LES Program staff did track the due date in a timely manner which resulted in the transition conferences being late. Therefore, 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 was late. High volume caseloads also impacted some service coordinators' performance. The Early Steps State Office will continue to monitor and ensure adequate training is conducted and that best practices for transition are being followed.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

To ensure noncompliant practices have been revised and the LES Programs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, the Early Steps State Office conducted a second review of child records for each of the eight LES Programs with findings of noncompliance. The Early Steps State Office reviewed updated data through a subsequent sample of 180 records for the eight LES Programs. This was done by reviewing a subsequent sample of IFSP records to ensure steps and services were provided within at least 90 days and not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday. One of the eight LES Programs achieved 100% compliance in the subsequent review of the sample of records. Another subsequent sample review of 118 records for the seven LES Programs was conducted for the months of July to December 2019. All the seven LES Programs achieved 100% compliance in the review. Again, this was done by reviewing a subsequent sample of IFSP records to ensure steps and services were provided within at least 90 days and not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday.

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

Fifteen children did not receive an IFSP with transition steps and services within at least 90 days and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday. The Early Steps State Office verified that that the LES Programs developed an IFSP with transition steps and services, although late, for the 15 children. This verification was based on follow up reporting and review of documentation provided by the LES Programs.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

<b>Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>
FFY 2017	2	2	0

**FFY 2017**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

To ensure noncompliant practices have been revised and the LES Programs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, the Early Steps State Office conducted several reviews of child records for each of the two LES Programs with findings of noncompliance. The Early Steps State Office reviewed updated data samples for the period between March to June 2019 and again in July to December 2019. Another sample for the two LES Programs was subsequently reviewed for March 2020. The two LES Programs achieved 100% compliance in the subsequent review of the sample of records. This was done by reviewing a subsequent sample of IFSP records to ensure steps and services were provided within at least 90 days and not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday.

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

Four children did not receive an IFSP with transition steps and services within at least 90 days and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday. The Early Steps State Office verified that that the LES Program developed an IFSP with transition steps and services. Although late, the IFSPs with transition steps and services were completed before the toddler's third birthday for the four children. This verification was based on follow up reporting and review of documentation provided by the LES Program.

**8A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**8A - OSEP Response**

Although the State's FFY 2019 data represent slippage from the FFY 2018 data and the State did not meet its FFY 2019 target for this indicator, the State did not, as required, provide an explanation of slippage. Specifically, the State reported that "a key factor impacting performance was service coordinator error in scheduling timely conferences. " However, Indicator 8A specifically measures the percentage of 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. Therefore, OSEP cannot accept the State's description of the reasons for slippage for this Indicator.

The State did not provide the reasons for delay, as required by the measurement table. Therefore, OSEP was unable to determine whether the State reviewed the reasons for delay.

**8A - Required Actions**

## Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8B - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	88.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	94.29%	85.56%	96.44%	95.29%	96.30%



**Targets**

FFY	2019
Target	100%

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

YES

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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
316	327	96.30%	100%	97.53%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Number of parents who opted out**

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

3

**Describe the method used to collect these data**

The data source for this Indicator comes from monitoring. All 15 LES Programs are monitored annually. This year's monitoring utilized a review of child record documentation and data verifying both notification to the Local and State Education Agencies. The monitoring sample was comprised of randomly selected child records based on local program size. A total of 330 records were reviewed.

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

YES

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

YES

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

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.**

All 15 LES Programs are monitored annually for this indicator. This year's monitoring utilized a review of child record documentation and data. The monitoring sample was comprised of randomly selected child records based on local program size. A total of 330 records were reviewed.

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

Several LES Programs did not track the notification due date in a timely manner which resulted in the notifications being sent late to the Local Education Agency and State Education Agency. Some LES Programs do not adequately track notification due dates when children enter the program very close to 90 days before the child's third birthday. The Early Steps State Office will continue to monitor and ensure adequate training is conducted on running reports for tracking due dates to ensure timely notification

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

To ensure noncompliant practices have been revised and the LES Programs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, the Early Steps State Office conducted a subsequent review of child records for each of the five LES Programs with findings of noncompliance. The Early Steps State Office reviewed a subsequent sample of 44 records for the five LES Programs with findings. The five LES Programs achieved 100% compliance on the subsequent reviews. This review verified correction of all five programs with findings. This was done by reviewing a subsequent sample of notification lists sent to the Local Education Agency and State Education Agency and verifying the information was sent in a timely manner at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday.

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

Notification to the State Education Agency (SEA) and the Local Education Agency (LEA) where the toddler resides was late for children. The Early Steps State Office verified that the LES Program provided notification to the State Education Agency (SEA) and the Local Education Agency (LEA) where the toddler resides. Although late, it did occur prior each toddler's third birthday for all ten toddlers. This verification was based on follow up reporting and review of documentation provided by the LES Program.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**8B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**8B - OSEP Response**

**8B - Required Actions**

## Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday}}{\text{\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C}} \right] \times 100$ .
- Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services}}{\text{\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B}} \right] \times 100$ .
- Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B}}{\text{\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B}} \right] \times 100$ .

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8C - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	70.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	91.43%	93.93%	93.53%	92.00%	95.76%

**Targets**

FFY	2019
Target	100%

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
281	330	95.76%	100%	92.73%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

A key factor impacting performance was service coordinator error in scheduling timely conferences. The LES Program staff did not track the due date in a timely manner which resulted in the transition conferences being late. High volume caseloads also impacted some service coordinators' performance. The Early Steps State Office will continue to monitor and ensure adequate training is conducted and that best practices for transition are being followed. Another factor impacting performance was the closure of school districts across the state due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Florida's public schools were temporarily closed beginning in March 2020, and then later closed for the remainder of the 2020 spring semester, through June 2020, resulting in the inability to appropriately plan and transition some children to preschool programs during the last three months of the fiscal year.

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

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

0

**Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances**

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

25

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

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.**

All 15 LES Programs are monitored annually. This year's monitoring utilized a review of child record documentation and data. The monitoring sample was comprised of randomly selected child records based on local program size. A total of 330 records were reviewed. Exceptional family circumstances included eleven programs with family schedule conflicts, one program with child illness and two programs with unsuccessful attempts to contact the family. An additional reason for delay in eight programs was service coordinator error in scheduling timely transition conferences with the family. LES Program staff did track the due date in a timely manner which resulted in the transition conferences being late. Therefore, the number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B occurred late. High volume caseloads also impacted some service coordinators' performance. The Early Steps State Office will continue to monitor and ensure adequate training is conducted and that best practices for transition are being followed.

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

The Early Steps State Office continued to work with the LES Programs regarding their improvement strategies on a monthly basis until correction of noncompliance was achieved.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

To ensure noncompliant practices have been revised and the LES Programs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, the Early Steps State Office conducted a second review of child records for each of the seven LES Programs with findings of noncompliance. The Early Steps State Office reviewed updated data through a subsequent sample of 160 records for the seven programs for July to December 2019. This was done by reviewing a subsequent sample of IFSP records to ensure a transition conference was completed within at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday. One of the seven LES Programs achieved 100% compliance in the subsequent review of the sample of records. A second sample review of 118 records for the six programs was conducted. The remaining six LES Programs

achieved 100% compliance in the review. Again, this was done by reviewing a subsequent sample of IFSP records to ensure a transition conference was completed within at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday.

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

Fifteen children did not receive a transition conference within at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday. The Early Steps State Office verified that the LES Programs conducted a transition conference. Although late, the transition conference was held before the toddler's third birthday.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2017	2	2	0

**FFY 2017**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

To ensure noncompliant practices have been revised and the local Early Steps programs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, the Early Steps State Office conducted several reviews of samples for the period between March to June 2019 and again in July to December 2019. Another subsequent sample for the two programs for March 2020 was reviewed. The Early Steps State Office reviewed updated data through a subsequent sample of 50 records for the two programs. This was done by reviewing a subsequent sample of IFSP records to ensure the transition conference was conducted within at least 90 days and not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday. The two programs achieved 100% compliance in the subsequent review of the sample of records

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

Four children did not receive a transition conference within at least 90 days and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday. The Early Steps State Office verified that the LES Program conducted a transition conference. Although late, the transition conference was held before the toddler's third birthday for the four children. This verification was based on follow up reporting and review of documentation provided by the LES Program.

**8C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**8C - OSEP Response**

The State did not provide the reasons for delay, as required by the measurement table. Therefore, OSEP was unable to determine whether the State reviewed the reasons for delay.

OSEP notes, the State reported in its narrative for correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 the verification of "transition steps and services" rather than early childhood "transition conference", as required by the Measurement Table for this indicator. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine that the State has corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. The State did not demonstrate that the EIS program or provider corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider.

**8C - Required Actions**

## Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Select yes to use target ranges.**

Target Range not used

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

NO

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target>=					
Data					

#### Targets

FFY	2019
Target>=	

#### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0				N/A	N/A

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

There were no resolution sessions held.

**9 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**9 - OSEP Response**

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2019. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

**9 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 10: Mediation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

Percent =  $((2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) \text{ divided by } 2.1) \text{ times } 100$ .

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 10 - Indicator Data

#### Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

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

NO

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target>=					
Data	50.00%				

#### Targets

FFY	2019
Target>=	

#### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
		0				N/A	N/A



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

There were no agreements related to due process complaints, no mediation agreements not related to due process complaints and no mediations held.

**10 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**10 - OSEP Response**

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2019. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

**10 - Required Actions**

## **Certification**

### **Instructions**

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

### **Certify**

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

### **Select the certifier's role**

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:**

Renee Jenkins

#### **Title:**

IDEA Part C Coordinator

#### **Email:**

renee.jenkins@flhealth.gov

#### **Phone:**

850-245-4456

#### **Submitted on:**

04/26/21 5:57:59 PM