

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: The Indiana APR for FFY 2005 was developed by the lead agency utilizing direction and input from a broad group of stakeholders made up of parents, providers, contractors, state staff, and community leaders from the Indiana Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC), Local Planning and Coordinating Councils (LPCC), System Points of Entry (SPOE), Quality Review Teams, the Central Reimbursement Office (CRO), and staff from Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA), Bureau of Child Development Services (BCDS) and the Indiana Department of Education, Division of Exceptional Learners. Several stakeholder meetings were held in 2005 and 2006 to discuss the State Performance Plan and Indiana’s progress in meeting its targets and the potential effects of rule changes regarding eligibility and cost participation.

Indiana has published its State performance Plan (SPP) on the state First Steps web page at http://www.in.gov/fssa/first_step/pdf/in20052010spppartc120205.pdf . Additionally, Indiana has posted OSEP’s letter responding to the State’s December 2005 SPP, http://www.in.gov/fssa/first_step/pdf/DOE%20letter%20march06page6.pdf . The SPP has also been published in the provider training newsletter, *The Training Times* at <http://www.utsprokids.org/TT%20vol%20%20%20iss1%20Final.PDF> . Indiana will post the revised SPP, APR and OSEP’s response to it, following its submission on February 1, 2007.

Indiana revised the December 2005 SPP, as requested in OSEP’s December 2005 SPP letter. The correct child count tables from FFY 2004 were added and all other issues are addressed in this APR.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 1: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

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

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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005	100% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs receive the early intervention services on their IFSP within <u>30 calendar days from IFSP date, with parental consent</u>

Definition of Timely: While Indiana places a high priority on the delivery of services in a timely manner, prior to the submission of the SPP in December 2005, Indiana did not have a formal definition for timely services. Timely previously was defined on an individual basis by the family, the service coordinator and the team. Indiana relied on information gleaned from file reviews, parent interviews, survey data and parent complaints identifying concerns with timely services. Previously, Indiana also reviewed the number of authorizations written compared with the number of claims paid. The state also sampled records to determine if all services authorized were provided to families. In these previous years, no systemic concerns were noted. The move to a formal definition of timely was proposed by the SPP stakeholder

committee in November 2005. Upon approval of the SPP by OSEP, Indiana officially adopted the definition of timely services as services starting within 30 days of the IFSP date with parent signature authorizing the signature.

In the 2005 SPP, Indiana defined timely as **all services written in the IFSP are initiated within 30 calendar days from the IFSP date, with parent approval**. The expectation is that 30 days represents a reasonable amount of time that may be allowed for services to begin. This time period allows adequate time for authorized services to be entered in the CRO database, for providers to be selected and for appointments with the family to be scheduled. As recommended by OSEP, in the SPP December 2005 letter, Indiana will allow an exception for IFSP services that are delayed due to exceptional family circumstances.

For FFY 2005, Indiana chose to review a sample of IFSPs written between July 1, 2005 and June 30, 2006 to determine if IFSP services were initiated within 30 days of the IFSP date, with parent approval. The Sampling Unit for this indicator included all children with an IFSP written during FFY 2005, (15,405). The Sample Size of 165 IFSPs was determined by using a sampling calculator made available from the website (<http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html>) by Raosoft, Inc. The number selected for this sample reflects a confidence level of 99%, with a confidence interval of +/- 10%. The Stratification Description used to ensure that all eligible children's IFSPs could be included in the sample employed a sampling strategy that used a proportional random selection process based on the following strata: (1) urban or rural residence, (2) gender and (3) ethnicity. The purpose of using these categories was to insure adequate representation of all children receiving First Steps services in Indiana. The data collection strategy involved samples from two counties in each of the nine regional clusters, using the same sample proportion as that of children receiving First Steps services in those counties (Table A)

Table A – APR Indicator 1 Sample Plan

	Part C total	% of Part C	Sample size	Rural	Male	Female	White	AA	Hispanic	Multi	Asian
Indiana - Statewide	15,405	100%		28%	63%	37%	78%	10%	6%	5%	1%
Actual Sample Demographics			168	25%	65%	35%	77%	10%	6.5%	5%	1%
Cluster A	2,091	11%	18				65	16	12	6	
Jasper	69	0.4	3	mixed			90	0	9	0	
Lake (Gary, Hammond)	1,237	6.4	15	no			55	23	16	6	
Cluster B	1,929	10%	16				72	11	11	5	
Elkhart	548	2.8	5	mixed			65	9	18	8	
St. Joseph (So. Bend)	878	4.6	11	mixed			66	17	9	6	
Cluster CH	3,151	16.40%	27				80	8	4	6	
Allen (Ft. Wayne)	1,221	6.3	18	no			67	16	7	7	
Madison	342	1.8	9	mixed			81	9	5	5	
Cluster D	1,137	5.90%	10				85	2	7	4	
Carroll	44	0.2	2	mixed			89	4.5	2	4.5	
Tippecanoe (W. Lafayette)	469	2.4	8	no			75	4	10	7	3
Cluster E	1,106	5.70%	9				88	3	4	4	
Fulton	45	0.2	2	yes			91	2	7		
Howard (Kokomo)	226	1.2	7	no			91	4	3	2	

Cluster F	1,012	5.30%	9				95	1.5	0.5	3	
Parke	29	0.2	2	yes			97	0	0	3	
Vigo (Terre Haute)	299	1.6	7	no			91	3	1	5	
Cluster G	5,771	30%	50				70	17	7	4	
Hamilton	1,153	6	17	no			90	3	1	2	
Marion (Indpls.)	3,404	18	33	no			55	26	11	5	
Cluster I	2,020	10.50%	17				88	4	2	4	
Floyd	265	1.4	8	no			84	9	2	4	
Vanderburgh (Evansville)	514	2.7	9	no			83	7	2	6	1.5
Cluster J	1,357	7%	12				89	1	3	5	2
Bartholomew	279	1.4	6	no			80	2	6	9	3
Monroe (Bloomington)	297	1.5	6	no			87	2	1	6	4

A random list of children from the sample plan was sent to each cluster. The cluster copied the service page of each child’s IFSP. Each provider listed on the IFSP service page was contacted and required to submit a face-to-face encounter form from their first visit with the child and family. Face-to-face encounter forms are required for all child/family visits. Providers must maintain copies of these forms to substantiate all claims for services rendered. The face-to-face encounter forms were reviewed to insure that the date of the first visit was within 30 calendar days of the IFSP date. Reasons for non-compliance were recorded.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005: The actual sample reviewed included 168 IFSPs written from July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006. **The state total for the provision of every service written on the IFSP, with 30 days of the IFSP date was 91% (Table B).** Of the IFSPs reviewed, 54% were written for Service Coordination and one other service, while 45% of the IFSPs had service coordination and multiple other services. 1% listed service coordination as the only service. 100% of the IFSPs reviewed had service coordination initiated within 30 days of the IFSP. (Indiana utilizes two levels of service coordination. The Intake Coordinator serves the family from referral through the initial IFSP, when the ongoing service coordinator is selected. 95% of the IFSPs reviewed had service coordination and at least one other service initiated within 30 days of the IFSP. Two cluster demonstrated 100% compliance of all services initiated within 30 days.

	# of IFSPs reviewed	% IFSPs with all services in 30 days, excluding family choice to delay	% IFSPs with ≥ one service initiated in 30 days	% IFSPs with no services initiated ≥ 30 days	# Family Choice to delay service(s)
Sample Total	168	91% (153)	95% (160)	5% (8)	17/168
Cluster A	18	83% (15)	94% (17)	6% (1)	2/18
Cluster B	16	94% (15)	94% (15)	6% (1)	1/16
Cluster CH	27	93% (25)	93% (25)	7% (2)	1/27
Cluster D	10	80% (8)	80% (8)	20% (2)	0/10
Cluster E	9	89% (8)	100% (9)	0% (0)	1/9
Cluster F	9	89% (8)	89% (8)	11% (1)	0/9
Cluster G	50	88% (44)	96% (48)	4% (2)	3/50

Cluster I	17	100% (17)	100% (17)	0% (0)	1/17
Cluster J	12	100% (12)	100% (12)	0% (0)	0/12

Account for untimely receipt of services for FFY 2005 - Reasons for untimely services included the following:

- 40% (3/8) - due to family choice, the specifically selected provider was not available
- 25% (2/8) - a specific therapist with specific skill was unavailable, ex. bilingual provider
- 25% (2/8) - delayed while waiting for a physician signature for IFSP services
- 10% (1/8) - provider was not immediately notified that the family selected them

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005: In FFY 04 (July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005), no file review sampling was performed. Data from the CRO database was reviewed for all authorized services written in every child’s initial IFSP. This data was compared to the first service claim date for each authorization to determine the number of IFSP early intervention services provided within 30 days of the IFSP date. Based on claims/authorization data, eighty percent (80%) of infants and toddlers were found to have received all IFSP early intervention services within 30 calendar days of the IFSP date. Indiana felt this data was flawed in that it could not account for duplicate, changed or canceled authorizations. The sample review of IFSPs written in FFY 05, demonstrated a significant improvement in the percent of IFSP services provided within 30 days of the IFSP date.

The December 2005 SPP letter noted that this indicator was found to be in non-compliance for FFY 2004, but in subsequent telephone conversations, between OSEP and the lead agency it was noted that for FFY 04, there was no definition of timely. As stated, timely previously was defined on an individual basis by the family, the service coordinator and the team. Indiana relied on information gleaned from file reviews, parent interviews, survey data and parent complaints identifying concerns with timely services.

In December 2005, the lead agency and the CRO were in the process of developing a web-based data system that would capture the IFSP date and the initial service visit for all authorized IFSP services. Web-SPOE was to be completed in January of 2006, but design set backs occurred. This necessitated the use of sampling for FFY 2005. Web-SPOE remains in the development phase and is anticipated to be operational in late 2007. Once Web-SPOE is operational, Indiana will be able to provide data on timely services for every active IFSP.

Until Web-SPOE is operational, Indiana added the review of timeliness for all IFSP services to its Quality Review – Focused Monitoring System. Part of the Indiana Quality Review process consists of monthly random early intervention record reviews for each Service Coordinator on the intake process for a newly eligible child/family and on the annual IFSP development. (Appendix 2, A & B - Intake and Annual Review forms). The review form includes documentation that services were initiated within 30 days of the IFSP date. This process was initiated August 1, 2006. Data utilizing this source of information will be available for the FFY 2006 APR.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005: The proposed target for this indicator must be 100%. While not currently at 100%, Indiana has demonstrated a significant improvement towards reaching this target. The following improvement activities are being implemented. In 2006, Indiana provided training to all enrolled providers regarding the definition of timely services. The issue was discussed in the statewide training newsletter, the Training Times in February 2006 and it was included in the annual mandatory provider meetings in April 2006. SPOE supervisors and service coordinator supervisors were trained regarding the definition of timely and the documentation guidelines for quality review-focused monitoring record audits, at their quarterly meeting in June of 2006.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 2: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.¹

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

Measurement: Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	94% of infants and toddlers with an IFSP primarily receive early intervention services in the natural environment for typically developing children.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006): 96% (17,956 of 18,405) of Indiana infants and toddlers with an IFSP, primarily receive early intervention services in the home or in programs and places for typically developing children.

In FFY 05 APR (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006) Indiana reported from its claims data (through the state data warehouse), that 96% of services were provided in the natural environment (home, child care provider, community setting, etc.). Since the adoption of natural environments and family routines as a Best Practice for Early Intervention Services, Indiana has experienced an increase of services in the natural environment every year. Indiana believes that there are circumstances when services cannot be provided in the natural environment and provides limited exceptions with acceptable IFSP team justification. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this percentage will increase significantly over time and Indiana has set its final target at 96% of IFSP services are provided in the natural environment for typically developing children.

As a secondary source of data, Indiana also measures the percent of services in the natural environment and the documentation of an acceptable justification when the IFSP team, including the parent and service coordinator, determines that exceptions are warranted. Quality Review focused monitoring, through early intervention record review, determined that 98% of the services in the initial IFSP and 97% of services in the annual IFSP were written to be provided in the natural environment.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006): Indiana experienced an increase, beyond the measurable and rigorous target of 2%. The target percent was based on FFY 2004 data.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006): No revisions to the proposed targets; improvement activities or timelines are required.

¹ At the time of the release of this package, revised forms for collection of 618 State reported data had not yet been approved. Indicators will be revised as needed to align with language in the 2005-2006 State reported data collections.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 3: 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)

Measurement:

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

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

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

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

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- 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.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

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 the (# 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 the (# 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 the (# 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 the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005	To be developed in FFY 06

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005: Not applicable - Targets will be set once the baseline data is available.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The statewide implementation of the First Steps evaluation system began November 1, 2002. The goal of the system is to assess First Step’s impact on all children and families exiting First Steps who have been in the system for a minimum of six months.

Data is collected on children and families entering First Steps from three sources: 1) at intake with portions of the Combined Enrollment Form, 2) during the initial evaluation through the Family Interview, and 3) at the initial IFSP meeting with portions of the completed IFSP. Service Coordinators are asked to assemble and send documents from these three sources to the Early Childhood Center for data entry. Data is also collected on children and families exiting First Steps. Service Coordinators are asked to conduct an Exit Interview with the family, and include developmental data from the other members of the

team. The forms that are used to collect information from entering and exiting children and families are available on the First Steps web site: http://www.state.in.us/fssa/first_step/outcomeseval.html.

A primary outcome of First Steps is that children make developmental progress in the cognitive, communicative, physical, self-help, and social/emotional areas. To assess if First Steps is meeting this outcome, information was gathered from entering children in three areas:

1. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) – The developmental level of the social-emotional domain in the current level of performance section of the initial Individualized Family Service Plan was used. In FFY 05, the determination of the developmental level was made through assessment and evaluation by the eligibility determination team (ED team) using a variety of developmental tools. Levels of development included: at age level, 15-25% delay; 26-50% delay or greater than 50% delay.
2. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) - The developmental level of the communication domain in the current level of performance section of the initial Individualized Family Service Plan was used. In FFY 05, the determination of the developmental level was made through assessment and evaluation by the eligibility determination team (ED team) using a variety of developmental tools. Levels of development included: at age level, 15-25% delay; 26-50% delay or greater than 50% delay.
3. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs - The developmental level of the adaptive domain in the current level of performance section of the initial Individualized Family Service Plan was used. In FFY 05, the determination of the developmental level was made through assessment and evaluation by the eligibility determination team (ED team) using a variety of developmental tools. Levels of development included: at age level, 15-25% delay; 26-50% delay or greater than 50% delay.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005: The following entry data for each of the three outcome areas is presented for children who entered Part C in FFY 2005.

1. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):
 - a. 54% of children functioning at a level comparable to same aged peer
 - b. 46% of children functioning at a level below same aged peers.
 - i. 17.4% of children functioning at a 15-25% delay
 - ii. 21.6% of children functioning at a 26-50% delay, and
 - iii. 7% of children functioning at a greater than 50% delay
2. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication):
 - a. 15.3% of children functioning at a level comparable to same aged peer
 - b. 84.7% of children functioning at a level below same aged peers
 - i. 19.2% of children functioning at a 15-25% delay
 - ii. 44.9% of children functioning at a 26-50% delay, and
 - iii. 20.5% of children functioning at a greater than 50% delay
3. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:
 - a. 51.7% of children functioning at a level comparable to same aged peer
 - b. 48.3% of children functioning at a level below same aged peer
 - i. 16.3% of children functioning at a 15-25% delay
 - ii. 22.7% of children functioning at a 26-50% delay, and
 - iii. 9.3% of children functioning at a greater than 50% delay

Discussion of Baseline Data: Baseline data was calculated from the initial IFSPs written from July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006. In that time, 6,352 initial IFSPs were written. Data for positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) was available in 27% of the IFSPs (1,737- social domain); data for acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) was available in 29% of the IFSPs (1866 – for communication domain); and data for use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs was available in 26% of the IFSPs (1,632 – adaptive

domain). The sample included only those entrance interview packets that were submitted to IIDC with all components completed. To insure that this sample was representative, a review of the sample demographics was conducted. Entrance packets were received from all counties. The sample demographics mirror those of the children receiving Part C services in Indiana.

Table C – Child outcome sample demographics

	Part C total	% of Part C	Sample size	Counties	Male	Female	White	AA	Hispanic	Multi	Asian
Indiana - Statewide	6352	100%		92	63%	37%	78%	10%	6%	5%	1%
Actual Sample Demographics			1632-1866	92	64.6%	35.4%	76.8%	9.1%	6.8%	5.7%	1.5%

Domain developmental levels were chosen because they most closely matched the OSEP outcomes and by choosing domain scores instead of cross-walking individual skill items, Indiana can proceed with its transition from the use of multiple developmental assessment tools, to the use the Assessment, Evaluation, Programming System for Infants and Children (AEPS® 2nd. Ed.), for eligibility determination and finally to the exclusive use of the Indiana Standards Tool for Alternative Reporting (ISTAR). Indiana is currently completing a General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG) that will align the ISTAR with the Indiana academic standards, perform reliability and validity studies on the ISTAR as a measure of academic standards progress, identify cut off scores for typical versus atypical development, and cross-walk ISTAR items with the OSEP child outcomes. This will allow Indiana to utilize one system for progress towards academic standards and the OSEP outcomes from birth through 9th grade. The GSEG project will be completed in December 2007. All children entering First Steps after July 1, 2007 will be assessed using the ISTAR (thus, negating the need for the use of sampling). Until the ISTAR is in use for all children in Part C, those children identified in the sample used for FFY 05 and FFY 06 will be followed through transition, utilizing the specified domain level of performance prior to transition.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	“N/A” means the information is not required in the SPP due February 2008.
2006 (2006-2007)	“N/A” means the information is not required in the SPP due February 2008.
2007 (2007-2008)	“N/A” means the information is not required in the SPP due February 2008.
2008 (2008-2009)	“N/A” means the information is not required in the SPP due February 2008.
2009 (2009-2010)	“N/A” means the information is not required in the SPP due February 2008.
2010 (2010-2011)	“N/A” means the information is not required in the SPP due February 2008.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 05: Indiana is proceeding with its transition from the use of multiple developmental assessment tools, to the use the Assessment, Evaluation, Programming System for Infants and Children (AEPS® 2nd. Ed.), for eligibility determination and finally to the exclusive use of the Indiana Standards Tool for Alternative Reporting (ISTAR). Indiana is currently completing a General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG) that will align the ISTAR with the Indiana academic standards, perform reliability and validity studies on the ISTAR as a measure of academic standards progress, identify cut scores for typical versus atypical development, and cross-walk ISTAR items with the OSEP child outcomes. This will allow Indiana to utilize one system for progress towards academic standards and the OSEP outcomes from birth through 9th grade. The GSEG project will be completed in December 2007. All children entering First Steps after July 1, 2007 will be assessed using the ISTAR (negating the need for

the use of sampling). Until the ISTAR is in use for all children in Part C, those children identified in the sample used for FFY 05 and FFY 06, will be followed through transition, utilizing the specified domain level of performance from prior to transition.

Included in the GSEG project are extensive training opportunities for Indiana Part C service coordinators and direct service providers on assessment and evaluation and the use of the ISTAR for measuring child performance. Indiana will insure the quality of the data entered as a component of the Quality Review-Focused Monitoring System. Using quality review teams that include peer reviewers, BCDS staff, and SPOE staff, a sample of records is reviewed annually to verify and validate data entry.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005: Not applicable.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 4: 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)

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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	A. 99% of families know their rights (of those responding). B. 99% of families can effectively communicate their children’s needs (of those responding). C. 99% of families can help their children develop and learn (of those responding).

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Statewide implementation of the First Steps evaluation system began November 1, 2002. The goal of the system is to assess First Steps’ impact on all children and families exiting First Steps who have been in the system for a minimum of six months. Complete background information on the evaluation system is contained in the Indicator 3 Overview. The outcomes below are taken from the evaluation study. Outcomes data is provided from the Exit Family Interviews. **A copy of the Family Interview and Exit Summary forms are attached (Appendix 3 and 4).**

1. Knowledge of First Steps rights

Exiting families are asked in the outcomes survey if they know and understand their rights under First Steps. Families receive verbal and written explanation of their rights during the intake process, at every IFSP meeting, and every procedural safeguard moment. The IFSP service page contains a statement that the family has received written and verbal explanation of their rights and the family reads and signs

this statement. Data for this indicator is compiled from the Exit Interview question 6.1, “I know about and understand my rights under First Steps.” The link to the entire Exit Interview is <http://www.in.gov/icpr/webfile/formsdiv/51310.pdf>

2. Effectively communicate their children’s needs

Exiting families are asked in the outcomes survey if they can effectively communicate their children’s needs in question 6.2.a “I know I can advocate for my child and family in a number of ways, including; sharing my concerns, needs and priorities.” Also during exit interviews, families are asked if they know what roles they could assume during the First Steps process (e.g., share information), and if they exercised any of these roles, including:

- sharing information during evaluation and assessment,
- contributing outcomes at the IFSP meeting,
- expressing agreement with the team, and
- doing things at home that are part of their IFSP and the team’s recommendations.

3. Help their children develop and learn

Exiting families are asked if the early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn in the outcomes survey in question 3.1.a-f; “I am comfortable knowing how to support my child’s learning and development in the areas of: a. communication skills; b. cognitive skills; c. gross motor skills; d. fine motor skills; e. social/emotional skills; and f. adaptive skills.

Actual Target Data FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

- A. 99.9% (3593 of 3595) of respondent families participating in Part C reported that early intervention services have helped the family know their First Steps rights.**
- B. 99.9% (3592 of 3594) of respondent families participating in Part C reported that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs.**
- C. 95.5% (3479 of 3644) of respondent families participating in Part C reported that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn.**

For FFY 2005, 4,744 families exited First Steps. All families leaving First Steps are asked to participate in an exit interview with their service coordinator. For the questions selected, there were responses from over 75% of exiting families. In the returned questionnaires, 12.6% (600) of the sample demographics were missing gender identification and 12.2% (580) did not disclose race. The sample included children from all counties in Indiana.

Table D: Family Outcomes Sample Demographics

	Exiting Part C	%exiting Part C	Sample size	Counties	Male	Female	White	AA	Hispanic	Multi	Asian
Indiana - Statewide	4744	100%		92	63%	37%	78%	10%	6%	5%	1%
Actual Sample Demographics		76%	3594-3644	92	54.3%	33.1%	70.4%	6.9%	4.7%	4.6%	1.1%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005: Indiana set very high expectations for Indicator 4 and was able to surpass the target for families knowing their rights and for families effectively being able to communicate their children’s needs. Data for the third category, early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn was 95.5%. This is less than the rigorous target of 99%. The question for this category was expansive in that it included all domains, but allowed only one answer.

3. Enhancing my child's learning and development As I leave First Steps ...	YES, MOST OF THE TIME	SOME OF THE TIME	NO, NOT OFTEN
3.1. I am comfortable knowing how to support my child's learning and development in the areas of:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. COMMUNICATION skills - to understand others, to express his or her own thoughts, and to carry on simple conversations			
b. COGNITIVE skills - to gain new knowledge, to solve problems			
c. GROSS MOTOR skills - to sit up, move around, and to play physical games			
d. FINE MOTOR skills - to reach, grasp or hold, and play with toys and objects			
e. SOCIAL/EMOTIONAL skills - to develop positive social relationships			
f. ADAPTIVE skills - to feed, dress, bathe, and toilet him or herself			

This problem has been alleviated. In 2006, the ICC chose to use the Early Childhood Outcome Center Family Survey. Training on the survey was conducted in October 2006. A data entry system is being developed to capture data on all elements. For FFY 2006, a sample of families exiting Part C will again be necessary, as the data system will not be operational for the complete FFY. Following FFY 06, Indiana will have a data base for all families exiting the system. Indiana will continue to provide training and support for service coordinators to increase the return rate of the surveys.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005: No changes to the targets, improvement activities or timelines are applicable.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 5: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to:

- A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and
- B. National data.

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

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to the same percent calculated for other States with similar (narrow, moderate or broad) eligibility definitions.
- B. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to National data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	1.40% of the Indiana population of infants and toddlers (birth-to-one) have an IFSP. (Revised from SPP)

Correction of baseline data: In the 2005-2010 SPP, Indiana used FFY 2003 data. The correct percent of children birth to one year with an IFSP for FFY 2004 is 1.69% and not 1.57% of the State's birth-to-one population with an IFSP as reported in the State Performance Plan (SPP)*.

*NOTE: Data from FFY 03 was used as the source for this indicator because Indiana began development of its State Performance Plan prior to the release of FFY 04 data. Indiana has amended this data in the APR and in the SPP.

Discussion of Baseline Data: Indiana now falls into the moderate category of eligibility. A review of states within this category revealed some major differences in eligibility criteria and in demographics. A representative stakeholder committee met to review this information. The stakeholder group narrowed the list of states to those that are comparable to Indiana in both eligibility criteria and population. Indiana's eligibility criteria was revised in 2006 through rule promulgation. Therefore, the SPP development committee chose states which had eligibility criteria similar to the proposed 2006 eligibility criteria. The committee selected comparable states from the broad eligibility category that 1) did not serve children who were biologically at risk, 2) had specific percentage(s) of delay for eligibility determination similar to Indiana, and 3) whose birth-to-three population more closely matched Indiana's. The 10 states chosen are listed in the table: *Comparison with Similar States, Children Ages 0-1 Year*.

None of the comparable states serve more infants, birth-to-one year old, than Indiana. The next closest states to Indiana were Pennsylvania with 1.45%, Kansas with 1.22% and Maryland with 1.23% of infants in the birth-to-one population. The remainder of the states in the comparison group served less than one percent of infants in the birth-to-one population. Nationally, 0.98% of infants less than one year old have an IFSP (all data from December 1, 2005 child counts is from http://www.rrfcnetwork.org/images/stories/FRC/spp_mat/2006_Dec/table%208-4a-2005.pdf).

The table below contains the corrected data from FFY 2004.

Corrected Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005): Comparison with Similar States, Children Ages 0-1 Year

STATE	DEC.2004 ONE-DAY CHILD COUNT, AGE 0-1	POPULATION 0-1	PERCENT OF POPULATION AGE 0-1	CURRENT ELIGIBILITY	RISK FACTORS
Indiana	1,456	86,163	1.69%	15% Delay In Two Areas Or 20% Delay In One Area	Eligibility changed May, 2006
Pennsylvania	2,113	145,759	1.45%	25% Delay In One Area; In cl opin	No
Wisconsin	782	68,647	1.14%	25% Delay In One Area Or Atypical Development As Determined By MDT With ICO	No
Maryland	926	75,601	1.22%	25% Delay In One Or More Areas, Atypical Development/Behavior	No
Arkansas	311	37,667	0.83%	25% Delay In One Or More Areas	No
Kansas	479	38,945	1.23%	25% Delay In One Or More Areas, 20% Delay In Two Areas	No
Iowa	420	37,571	1.12%	25% Below Age In One Or More Areas, Prof. Judgment of MDT or A Known Condition With High Prop. of Delay	No
Virginia	578	100,219	0.58%	25% Delay In One Area Or Atypical Development; ICO	No
Washington	389	76,487	0.51%	25% Delay In One Area	No
Mississippi	318	42,880	.74%	25% Delay In One Or More Areas; ICO	No
Alabama	291	59,756	0.49%	25% Delay In One Or More Areas	No
National	40,566	4,143,461	0.98%		

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

Comparison with Similar States, Children Ages 0-1 Year

STATE	DEC.2005 ONE-DAY CHILD COUNT, AGE 0-1	POPULATION 0-1	PERCENT OF POPULATION AGE 0-1	CURRENT ELIGIBILITY	RISK FACTORS
Indiana	1,217	86,945	1.40%	20% Delay In Two Areas Or 25% Delay In One Area; inf. Clin. Opin.	No
Pennsylvania	2,365	147,0369	1.61%	25% Delay In One Area; Inf. Clin. Opin.	No

Wisconsin	713	69,005	1.03%	25% Delay In One Area Or Atypical Development As Determined By MDT With ICO	No
Maryland	951	76,493	1.24%	25% Delay In One Or More Areas, Atypical Development/Behavior	No
Arkansas	151	38,621	0.39%	25% Delay In One Or More Areas	No
Kansas	477	38,596	1.24%	25% Delay In One Or More Areas, 20% Delay In Two Areas	No
Iowa	456	37,460	1.22%	25% Below Age In One Or More Areas, Prof. Judgment of MDT or A Known Condition With High Prop. of Delay	No
Virginia	538	104,945	0.51%	25% Delay In One Area Or Atypical Development; ICO	No
Washington	406	79,712	0.51%	25% Delay In One Area	No
Mississippi	207	44,453	.47%	25% Delay In One Or More Areas; ICO	No
Alabama	296	60,803	0.49%	25% Delay In One Or More Areas	No
National	39,649	4,165,404	.99%		

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

Indiana anticipated very little improvement in its percentage of infants, birth to 1 year with an IFSP. Indiana serves a high number of infants less than one year. The revised eligibility criteria, effective in May 2006, eliminated the biological risk category. It raised the percentage of developmental delay from a 15% delay in two developmental domains to 20% delay **and** from a 20% in one developmental domain to 25% delay. The State was confident that it could maintain and slightly improve the number of infants, birth to one year of age with an IFSP, especially since these changes did not actually take place until the end of FFY 2006.

Additionally, a second legislative change implemented in March of 2006 was an increase in cost participation criteria and co-pay fees. Cost participation for direct services is formulated on a sliding fee schedule based on family income, family size and federal poverty level. Families are billed on a per service basis up to a monthly maximum.

In FFY 2003, Indiana served 1.57% of children, birth to one year. In FFY 2004 that number increased to 1.69%. FFY 2005 showed a decrease in the number of infants, birth to one year with an IFSP to 1.40%. Eligibility and cost participation changes had not taken place until mid to late 2006. Therefore, the actual effect has not been experienced. Indiana will likely continue to experience decreases in its child counts.

In spite of the decrease in the number of children served (birth to one year), Indiana still exceeds all of the comparable states, with the exception of Pennsylvania. Indiana also significantly exceeds the national percentage of .99%.

In Table A, OSEP required Indiana to submit a grant application amendment for OSEP’s approval, of any proposed revisions to its eligibility criteria policies and system of payment policies. Both the changes in eligibility and cost participation were submitted to OSEP in Indiana’s grant application in the Spring of 2006. No changes were implemented until after approval was received from OSEP.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005 -2010: Due to its change in eligibility and in response to the changes in cost participation, Indiana is revising its rigorous and measurable targets. Indiana has reset its annual target to 1.40% of its birth-to-one population. This uses FFY 2005 as the baseline. This target is well above the national average of 0.99% and ranks second among comparable states.

Indiana will continue with its improvement activities and timelines as outlined in the SPP.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	1.40% of the birth-to-one children will have an IFSP
2006 (2006-2007)	1.40% of the birth-to-one children will have an IFSP
2007 (2007-2008)	1.40% of the birth-to-one children will have an IFSP
2008 (2008-2009)	1.40% of the birth-to-one children will have an IFSP
2009 (2009-2010)	1.40% of the birth-to-one children will have an IFSP
2010 (2010-2011)	1.40% of the birth-to-one children will have an IFSP

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 6: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to:

- A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and
- B. National data.

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

Measurement:	
A.	Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to the same percent calculated for other States with similar (narrow, moderate or broad) eligibility definitions.
B.	Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to National data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	3.35% of the birth-to-three will have an IFSP

Correction of baseline data: In the 2005-2010 SPP, Indiana used FFY 2003 data. Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005): Comparison with Similar States, Children Ages 0-2 Year

STATE	DEC.2004 ONE-DAY CHILD COUNT, AGE 0-2	POPULATION 0-2	PERCENT OF POPULATION AGE 0-2	CURRENT ELIGIBILITY	RISK FACTORS
Indiana	10,067	255,744	3.94%	20% Delay In Two Areas Or 25% Delay In One Area	No
Pennsylvania	13,297	432,315	3.08%	25% Delay In One Area; In cl opin	No
Wisconsin	5,756	203,618	2.83%	25% Delay In One Area Or Atypical Development As Determined By MDT With ICO	No
Maryland	6,276	225,878	2.78%	25% Delay In One Or More Areas, Atypical Development/Behavior	No
Arkansas	3,283	111,706	2.94%	25% Delay In One Or More Areas	No
Kansas	2,947	114,457	2.57%	25% Delay In One Or More Areas, 20% Delay In Two Areas	No

Iowa	2,331	109,781	2.12%	25% Below Age In One Or More Areas, Prof. Judgment of MDT or A Known Condition With High Prop. of Delay	No
Virginia	5,369	299,736	1.79%	25% Delay In One Area Or Atypical Development; ICO	No
Washington	3,859	230,108	1.68%	25% Delay In One Area	No
Mississippi	2,126	125,719	1.69%	25% Delay In One Or More Areas; ICO	No
Alabama	2,261	176,839	1.28%	25% Delay In One Or More Areas	No
National	275,484	12,311,909	2.24%		

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

STATE	DEC.2005 ONE-DAY CHILD COUNT, AGE 0-2	POPULATION 0-2	PERCENT OF POPULATION AGE 0-2	CURRENT ELIGIBILITY	RISK FACTORS
Indiana	9,890	257,903	3.83%	20% Delay In Two Areas Or 25% Delay In One Area	No
Pennsylvania	14,511	438,037	3.31%	25% Delay In One Area; In cl opin	No
Wisconsin	5,903	205,118	2.88%	25% Delay In One Area Or Atypical Development As Determined By MDT With ICO	No
Maryland	6,607	229,517	2.88%	25% Delay In One Or More Areas, Atypical Development/Behavior	No
Arkansas	2,985	113,407	2.25%	25% Delay In One Or More Areas	No
Kansas	2,985	113,903	2.62%	25% Delay In One Or More Areas, 20% Delay In Two Areas	No
Iowa	2,588	110,209	2.35%	25% Below Age In One Or More Areas, Prof. Judgment of MDT or A Known Condition With High Prop. of Delay	No
Virginia	5,338	310,381	1.72%	25% Delay In One Area Or Atypical Development; ICO	No
Washington	4,248	237,834	1.79%	25% Delay In One Area	No
Mississippi	1,732	129,192	1.34%	25% Delay In One Or More Areas; ICO	No
Alabama	2,476	178,392	1.39%	25% Delay In One Or More Areas	No
National	290,753	12,409,853	2.34%		

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005: Baseline data for FFY 2005 demonstrated a sizeable decrease in the number of children, birth to three with an IFSP (3.83%, down from 3.94% in 2004, but up from 3.35% in 2003). This data is for a period of time before the changes to Indiana’s eligibility and cost participation.

Indiana anticipated a decrease of its percentage of children, birth to 3 years with an IFSP and this was seen in the FFY 2005 numbers. Indiana continues to serve a high number of children. The revised eligibility criteria, (not fully in effect until October of 2006), has eliminated the biological risk category. It increases the percentage of developmental delay from a 15% delay in two developmental domains to a 20% delay and from a 20% in one developmental domain to a 25% delay. Projections indicate a potential 15% decrease in the number of children eligible under the new criteria.

A second legislative change that also was implemented in May of 2006 was an increase in cost participation scale and co-pay fees. Cost participation for direct services is formulated on a sliding fee schedule based on family income, family size and federal poverty level. Families are billed on a per service basis up to a monthly maximum. The new cost participation levels represent a significant increase in costs for families. The State believes that some families may opt to seek services through insurance, or other sources.

Indiana will continue to work with LPCCs/SPOEs to increase child find activities for this age group and will continue to work with the medical community on timely and appropriate referrals for infants and toddlers.

In Table A, OSEP required Indiana to submit a grant application amendment for OSEP’s approval, of any proposed revisions to its eligibility criteria policies and system of payment policies. Both the changes in eligibility and cost participation were submitted to OSEP in Indiana’s grant application in the Spring of 2006. No changes were implemented until after approval was received from OSEP.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005: Indiana will maintain its original proposed targets, improvement activities and timelines as written in the SPP.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	3.35% of the birth-to-three will have an IFSP
2006 (2006-2007)	3.25% of the birth-to-three will an IFSP
2007 (2007-2008)	3.15% of the birth-to-three will an IFSP
2008 (2008-2009)	3.10% of the birth-to-three will an IFSP
2009 (2009-2010)	3.05% of the birth-to-three will an IFSP
2010 (2010-2011)	3.00% of the birth-to-three will an IFSP

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 7: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and 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)

Measurement:

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

Account for untimely evaluations.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of eligible children will have an evaluation/assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006): Each System Point of Entry (SPOE) Cluster must report to the state on every IFSP that exceeds the 45 day timeline. A “Delay of IFSP” form is completed for every IFSP that exceeds the 45-day timeline. This form provides information on why the initial 45 day timeline was not met. The parent must sign this form indicating that they acknowledge their rights and procedural safeguards and understand that the IFSP will exceed the 45-day timeline and they agree with the reasons listed. Supporting documentation as to the circumstances is also included in the case notes. The Delay of IFSP form and the case notes become part of the early intervention record. In order to monitor that the IFSP timelines are met there is a Quality Review/Focused Monitoring process to examine any instances of IFSP delay. A determination is then made by a Focus Monitor whether the delay was the result of a family exceptional circumstance (ex. Family medical emergency, child illness, family relocation or custody change) or a system issue. Data is analyzed and then distributed to the SPOE offices on all IFSPs written and on the number exceeding 45 days. On-site file reviews are completed to validate the information provided by the SPOE.

In FFY 2005, 9,036 initial IFSPs were conducted. Excluding family reasons, 99.62% were conducted within the 45 day timeline. This represents an improvement from the 98.56% reported for FFY 2004.

IFSPs Written within 45 days of Referral					System Issues
	IFSPs	% ≤ 45 days	# ≥ 45 days	Family Choice/Issues	
State Total	9036	99.62%	146	112	34
Cluster A	967	99.90%	8	7	1
Cluster B	880	99.89%	14	13	1
Cluster CH	1485	98.79%	59	41	18
Cluster D	536	99.81%	3	2	1

Cluster E	542	98.15%	17	7	10
Cluster F	433	100.00%	2	2	0
Cluster G	2716	99.93%	28	26	2
Cluster I	847	100.00%	8	8	0
Cluster J	630	99.84%	7	6	1

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006): Indiana has made great strides towards meeting 100% compliance of the 45-day timeline requirement. To monitor each cluster region’s performance in conducting IFSP meetings within 45 days of referral, the SPOEs must provide written documentation to explain circumstances under which any initial IFSP that exceeds 45 days. Monthly a SPOE database report is generated on all initial IFSPs exceeding the 45 day timeline providing the total number of delayed initial IFSPs. This report is matched with the Delay of IFSP forms completed by each SPOE office and the determination of family or system issues. This information is also validated through a focused monitoring process. Additionally, a performance based standard is written into the SPOE Request for Funding (RFF) contracts requiring each local SPOE office to ensure initial IFSPs are completed within 454 days. Funds linked to the achievement of this standard are reviewed semi-annually.

Team members that are part of the initial IFSP process are continuously trained on the importance of timely completion of this process and to understand the policies and procedures established to insure that families have an initial IFSP within the 45 day time frame. The State publishes county, regional, and statewide profile reports that includes 45-day timeline compliance information on the First Steps website (www.in.gov/fssa/first_step/index.html).

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006): No changes to the proposed targets, improvement activities or timelines are indicated.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Indicator 8: Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:

- A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;
- B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and
- C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.

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

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	A. 100% of eligible children will have IFSPs with transition steps and services. B. 100% of all children exiting Part C will have Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B. C. 100% of all children exiting Part C will have a transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.

Actual Target Data for FFY 05:

- A. 100% (18,704 of 18,704) of eligible children have IFSPs with transition steps and services. Every IFSP includes a section on transition steps and services that must be completed by the IFSP team.
- B. 100% (3,922 of 3,922- This total consists of 3,266 children referred to the LEA and 726 excluded, due to no consent to share information with the LEA) of all children exiting Part C had evidence of Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B.
- C. 96% (3,773 of 3,922) of all children exiting Part C had a transition conference, if potentially eligible for Part B.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 05:

- A. The data source for transition steps and services in the IFSP was early intervention record reviews conducted by the Quality Review – Focused Monitoring Team from April 2006 through

June 2006. Early intervention records were selected by random sample from each of the 9 cluster SPOEs. The random sample consisted of two closed records for every service coordinator. The sample included children who were enrolled in First Steps until 36 months of age and who had received services for at least 6 months (N=504). 100% (504 of 504) of all reviewed IFSPs included a plan for transition steps and services. While the state has met the 100% target for Indicator 8A, (Children have an IFSP with transition steps and services); the state will continue to provide support and focused monitoring on this indicator to increase the level of quality and functionality of the transition steps and services documented in the IFSP. In FFY 2005, quality review-focused monitoring reported that 89% (449 of 504) of the audited transition plans completely met Indiana's quality review criteria for transition goals that are appropriate, measurable and timely. This is an increase of 20% over the 69% from FFY 2004. (A copy of the transition record audit form is included in the appendix)

B. In FFY 05, 3,922 children exited Part C, and were potentially eligible for Part B services as reported from the SPOE electronic database. While not all families consented to share information with the LEA, the Indiana DOE Division of Exceptional Learners reported that Part B received referrals for 3,266 children from First Steps. Part B found 86% (2,795 of 3,266) of these children eligible for Part B services.

In Table A, attached to the OSEP December SPP letter that was received on March 2, 2006, OSEP cited Indiana for noncompliance with Indicator 8B. Indiana now meets the 100% target for Indicator 8B for FFY 2005. Indiana anticipates that it will remain at 100% compliance for Indicator 8B, as the state now notifies the LEA through an electronic transfer of data.

C. Indiana is at 96% compliance with Indicator 8C. The number of transition meetings held was compiled from actual electronic SPOE data, without the use of surveys or other monitoring. The SPOE cannot enter a transition meeting date unless and until, the transition packet and checklist are complete. While the state may not be able to report an actual transition meeting for every child, Indiana believes that it does comply with Indicator 8C. Indiana revised its IFSP forms to include documentation of transition steps and services. At a minimum, each IFSP is reviewed by the family and the service coordinator every six months. This review includes the discussion of transition activities and options that are appropriate for the child. As the child approaches 24 months, the service coordinator discusses with the family, information regarding Part B services. It is at this time that the service coordinator solicits consent for sharing information with the LEA and prepares for the transition conference with the LEA, if the family consents. Indiana believes that this process does comply with 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i). The state does concur that it must do better in documenting these meetings and has provided training and support to service coordinators, in addition to the changes to state forms and the electronic data that is maintained.

In attachment Table B of the December 2005 SPP OSEP letter to the state, OSEP identified Indicator 8C to be a previously identified issue. While Indiana has made improvements in the percent of children, exiting Part C who had a transition meeting, (now 96%), the state is not able to document 100% compliance with this indicator. Additionally, Table A, also noted that Indiana was in noncompliance for indicator 8C and further that the state may not use survey data as the primary source of data for this indicator.

The state is confident that it now has electronic data to support a transition meeting for all children exiting Part C. Indiana received notification of this issue on March 2, 2006, it will conduct a comprehensive SPOE data and file review beginning in April of 2007 to insure that it has corrected this deficiency.

In correcting this deficiency, Indiana has taken the following actions.

- In 2005, a new field was added to the SPOE electronic database to capture the actual transition meeting date for all children in Part C.

- The state developed a transition packet and checklist for use by service coordinators to plan, implement and document all requirements.
- Service Coordinators are now employed and supervised by the local cluster SPOE.
- A timeline tracking tool for service coordination was developed to assist in compliance with convening transition meetings 270 to 90 days before the child's third birthday.
- The state financially and programmatically supports the State Transition Initiative team and coordinator, including regional transition facilitators.
- Annual statewide training on transition is provided, in addition to transition articles in the Training Times Newsletter for all First Steps providers.
- A transition training DVD was developed and distributed to all clusters.
- Focused monitoring quality reviews are conducted, specific to transition, annually.
- 2006-2007 LPCC/SPOE Request for Funds included a requirement for transition committees in each cluster. Transition committee to be comprised of parents, providers, service coordinators, LEA representatives, and Head Start.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005: The rigorous and measurable targets for this indicator must all be 100%. Indiana will continue with its 2005 SPP improvement activities and timelines.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 9: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005	<p>100% of non-compliance related to monitoring priority areas and indicators are corrected within one year of identification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. # of findings of noncompliance. b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. <p>100% of non-compliance related to areas not included in the above monitoring priority areas and indicators are corrected within one year of identification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. # of findings of noncompliance. b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. <p>100% of non-compliance identified through other mechanisms (complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc.) corrected within one year of identification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. # of findings of noncompliance. b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

100% of non-compliance related to monitoring priority areas and indicators are corrected within one year of identification.

- a. 3 findings of noncompliance.
- b. 3 corrections completed as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from identification date of March 2, 2006.

100% of non-compliance related to areas not included in the above to monitoring priority areas and indicators are corrected within one year of identification.

- a. 0 findings of noncompliance.
- b. 0 corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

100% of non-compliance identified through other mechanisms (complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc.) corrected within one year of identification

- a. 0 findings of noncompliance.
- b. 0 corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Indicator 9A:

Table B: In attachment Table B of the December 2005 SPP OSEP letter to the state, OSEP identified Indicator 8C to be a previously identified issue. Indiana continues to make in that 96% of children exiting at age three had a transition meeting. The state is confident that it now has electronic data to support a transition meeting documentation for all children exiting Part C. Indiana received notification of this issue on March 2, 2006, it will conduct a comprehensive SPOE data and file review beginning in April of 2007 to insure that it has corrected this deficiency. Indiana continues to strive for 100% compliance and in correcting this deficiency, the state has taken the following actions.

- o In 2005, a new field was added to the SPOE electronic database to capture the actual transition meeting date for all children in Part C.
- o The state developed a transition packet and checklist for use by service coordinators to plan, implement and document all requirements.
- o Service Coordinators are now employed and supervised by the local cluster SPOE.
- o A timeline tracking tool for service coordination was developed to assist in compliance with convening transition meetings 270 to 90 days before the child's third birthday.
- o The state financially and programmatically supports the State Transition Initiative team and coordinator, including regional transition facilitators.
- o Annual statewide training on transition is provided, in addition to transition articles in the Training Times Newsletter for all First Steps providers.
- o A transition training DVD was developed and distributed to all clusters.
- o Focused monitoring quality reviews are conducted, specific to transition, annually.
- o 2006-2007 LPCC/SPOE Request for Funds included a requirement for transition committees in each cluster. Transition committee to be comprised of parents, providers, service coordinators, LEA representatives, and Head Start.

Table A: In attachment Table A of the December 2005 SPP OSEP letter to the state, received March 2, 2006, OSEP identified three areas of noncompliance, Indiana is confident that each of these indicators will be corrected within one year of identification.

Indicator 1 – 100% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs receive the early intervention services in a timely manner. In the SPP, Indiana reported an 80% level of compliance based on FFY 04 (July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005). At that time, no file review sampling was performed. Data from the CRO database was reviewed for all authorized services written in every child's initial IFSP. This data was compared to the first service claim date for each authorization to determine the number of IFSP early intervention services provided within 30 days of the IFSP date. Based on claims/authorization data, eighty percent (80%) of infants and toddlers were found to have received all IFSP early intervention services within 30 calendar days of the IFSP date. Indiana felt this data was flawed in that it could not account for exceptional family circumstances, data errors, duplicate, changed or canceled authorizations. The sample review of IFSPs written in

FFY 05, demonstrated a significant improvement in the percent of IFSP services provided within 30 days of the IFSP date, 91%.

The December 2005 SPP letter noted that this indicator was found to be in non-compliance for FFY 2004, but in subsequent telephone conversations, between OSEP and the lead agency it was noted that for FFY 04, there was no definition of timely. As stated, timely previously was defined on an individual basis by the family, the service coordinator and the team. Indiana relied on information gleaned from file reviews, parent interviews, survey data and by concerns and complaints regarding timely service. No systemic issue has ever been noted. The move to a formal definition of timely was proposed by the SPP stakeholder committee in November 2005. Upon approval of the SPP by OSEP, Indiana officially adopted the definition of timely as all services starting within 30 days of the IFSP date with parent signature authorizing the service.

In December 2005, the lead agency and the CRO were in the process of adapting a web-based data system that would capture the IFSP date and the initial service visit for all authorized IFSP services. Web-SPOE was to be completed in January of 2006, but design set backs occurred. This necessitated the use of sampling for FFY 2005. Web-SPOE remains in the development phase and is anticipated to be operational in late 2007. Once Web-SPOE is operational, Indiana will be able to provide data on timely services for every active IFSP.

Until Web-SPOE is operational, Indiana added the review of timeliness for all IFSP services to its Quality Review – Focused Monitoring System. Part of the Indiana Quality Review process consists of monthly random early intervention record reviews for each Service Coordinator on the intake process for a newly eligible child/family and on the annual IFSP development. (Appendix, 2A & 2B - Intake and Annual Review forms). The review form includes documentation that services were initiated within 30 days of the IFSP date. This process was initiated August 1, 2006. Data utilizing this source of information will be available for the FFY 2006 APR.

Indicator 7 – 100% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C’s 45 day timeline. In the SPP, Indiana reported a 95.63% level of compliance for Indicator 7. In this APR, for FFY 05, Indiana is reporting that 99.62% of initial IFSPs are conducted within the 45 day timeline. Indiana regards this level to be at compliance for the indicator.

Indiana reviews every initial IFSP that is out of compliance with this indicator. Families are fully informed of their right to an IFSP within 45 days of referral and only exceptional family circumstances are excluded. These circumstances must be documented and the Delay in IFSP form is signed by the family. Eight of the nine clusters were at 99.5% to 100% compliance. The state currently penalizes clusters who do not meet 100% with this indicator and it will continue to provider support and training for these clusters.

Indicator 8B – Notification to the LEA, if child is potentially eligible for Part B services. In the SPP, Indiana reported 94.7% level of compliance for Indicator 8B. In this APR, Indiana is reporting a 100% compliance with this indicator. Indiana has developed many improvement activities to correct its previous non-compliance. These include:

- 1) The expansion of the transition steps and services page in the IFSP, along with training and ongoing focused monitoring to insure its completion.
- 2) Beginning in July of 2007, Indiana will begin assessing all children using the ISTAR. Through the use of ISTAR and a unique student test number, each district will have access to information on all of the children from their district who are receiving Part C services, unless the family opts not to share this information. This will insure 100% notification to LEAs for all children potentially eligible for Part B services.
- 3) Indiana requires a transition meeting for all children exiting from Part C services, 270 to 90 days prior to the child’s third birthday. Previously, data for this indicator had been taken from

transition surveys. In 2005, the transition meeting date was made a data field in the SPOE database. It is also monitored by focused monitoring record reviews.

2. Indicator 9B: Indiana had no findings of non-compliance from non-priority areas. Included in this indicator would be findings of non-compliance from the cluster SPOEs through focused monitoring review. In April of 2005, there was a decrease of regional cluster SPOEs from 14 to 9. The reorganization of these clusters made it difficult to hold a newly formed cluster responsible for finding in a county that was not initially their responsibility. To establish a baseline, the quality review-focused monitoring teams performed an on-site review of every cluster from April through June 2006. This review provided this basis for cluster compliance with state and federal rules and with quality indicators. Following that review, each cluster received a report from the BCDS, identifying areas for improvement. The cluster SPOE and LPCC were required to develop improvement plans and to report quarterly on their progress. The quality review-focused monitoring teams will revisit each cluster during the months of April through June 2007. Areas of non-compliance may be issued following those visits. Cluster SPOEs and LPCCs will be given one year to correct any identified non-compliance.

3. Indicator 9C: Indiana reported two written complaints in FFY 2006 (Part C SPP/APR Attachment 1) Both of the complaints were regarding individual service coordinators and neither identified an area of non-compliance. Indiana did not have any hearings or mediations in FFY 2006.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006: Prior to the receipt on March 2, 2006, of the OSEP SPP letter of acceptance, Indiana had not received a non-compliance. The development of the SPP required many changes in the way Indiana collects and analyzes data. It is unfortunate that the SPP and subsequent APR were for time periods prior to the SPP development and acceptance. When Indiana received its SPP letter of acceptance, only 3 months remained in the FFY. Indiana now believes that it has a firm foundation of data on which to measure its compliance and anticipates correction of all non-compliance within the year.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005: There are no changes to the proposed targets. Indiana will continue to refine its quality review-focused monitoring system to identify and correct areas of non-compliance.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 10: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006): In FFY 2005, Indiana received 2 signed, written complaints. 2/2 signed, written complaints had reports issued within the 60 day timeline.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006): Indiana had 2 written complaints in FFY 04 and in FFY 05. All complaints had reports issued within the 60 day timeline.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005: None applicable. Indiana will continue to conduct annual procedural safeguard training for all intake and service coordinators.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 11: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005	100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006: Indiana did not receive any due process requests in FFY 2005.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005: There is no progress or slippage to report for FFY 2005.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005: No revisions to the proposed targets, improvement activities or timelines are applicable for this indicator.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 12: 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)

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005	NA - OSEP FAQ update: A State should not set targets for Indicator 12 unless it has received at least a minimum threshold for 10 hearing requests and has adopted the Part B due process hearing procedures under 34 CFR §303.420.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005: No due process hearing requests have been received, but policies and procedures are in place if needed.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005: There is no progress or slippage to report for FFY 2005. Indiana continues to train System Point of Entry (SPOE) service coordinators in procedural safeguards at their quarterly meetings.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005: No revisions to the proposed targets, improvement activities or timelines are applicable for this indicator.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 13: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005	NA - OSEP FAQ update: A State should not set targets for Indicator 13 unless its baseline data reflect that it has received a minimum threshold of 10 mediation requests.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005: No mediation requests have been received, but policies and procedures are in place, if needed.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005: There is no progress or slippage to report for FFY 2005. Indiana continues to train System Point of Entry (SPOE) service coordinators in procedural safeguards at their quarterly meetings.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005: No revisions to the proposed targets, improvement activities or timelines are applicable for this indicator.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 14: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

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

Measurement: State reported data, including 618 data, State performance plan, and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, settings and November 1 for exiting, personnel, dispute resolution); and
- b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring error free, consistent, valid and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005	100% of the State reported data are timely and accurate.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005: 100% of the required state reported data, including 618 data, SPP and APR are submitted on due date and are accurate.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005: Indiana has an excellent history of submitting accurate and timely data to OSEP. The state is confident in the accuracy of its comprehensive data system. Data from the IFSP is entered directly by the SPOE and claims information is entered by the CRO. Missing data elements on IFSPs are returned to service coordinators for completion. On-site observation is conducted to provide verification of SPOE data through early intervention record review. Quarterly reports and profile reports help to identify any anomalies present in the data.

Training is conducted regarding requirements and procedures for collecting and reporting data for individuals who perform data entry functions (SPOEs and intake/service coordinators). The data entry manual, annual report and APR are posted on the State website. The dynamic nature of the system requires constant validation of data and on-going training.

In August, Indiana participated in an OSEP validation visit. Indiana was found to have a reasonable approach in its data collection and analysis.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005: There are no proposed revisions to the targets, improvement activities or timelines.