

Annual Performance Report Summary February 1, 2016

Annual Reporting to the US Department of Education, Office for Special Education Programs

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) requires that each state develops a State Performance Plan (SPP) which details the state's implementation of IDEA. Following the development of the Plan, the state reports its progress toward implementing the Plan in its Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted to the Office for Special Education Programs (OSEP) in February each year. This year marks the second year of the SPP cycle for 2013-2018. Since the release of the final SPP requirements in Spring, 2014, the lead agency staff, the SICC, and stakeholders have been working on the development and implementation of the new SPP. These activities have included reviewing data from the last SPP cycle, reviewing requirements for the new period, reviewing targets for performance indicators and developing the newest component of the SPP, the State Systemic Improvement Plan or SSIP. The APR outlines this effort and provides an overview of performance results for the portion of the APR which was submitted on February 1, 2016. The SSIP portion of the report will be submitted by April 1, 2016 and will be reported to stakeholders separately. The complete APR will be distributed to SICC members and stakeholders and posted to the website at <http://www.earlysteps.dhh.louisiana.gov>. Following its review of the APR, OSEP will issue each state's *determination* of the SPP and the performance results. For the previous 4 years, Louisiana has achieved the highest possible determination: **Meets Requirements**. With a new performance measurement matrix developed by OSEP for the new SPP period, Louisiana's 2013-14 determination was: **Needs Assistance**. The state will receive its determination for this 2014-15 APR in June, 2016.

The following table identifies each indicator, provides the state's performance in 2013-14 and gives the targets and the results for 2014-15. Louisiana reports on a total of 16 indicators, including "subindicators." For 2014-15, EarlySteps had improvement in 12 indicators. There are 5 compliance indicators (must reach 100% performance) for which the state met the 100% target in 1 with improvement in 1. There are 12 results indicators (the state sets its own target) for which EarlySteps met the targets for 9 of the indicators.

A summary of the APR performance is outlined in the following table and the whole APR follows the table. The APR document provides details regarding the development of the APR and performance by indicator. The SSIP indicator 11 will be submitted in April, 2016 and become part of this document at that time.

**Annual Performance Report
Stakeholder Update
February 1, 2016**

Final Results

***indicates met/exceeded target**

Indicator	Data Collection Process- 2013-14	Data Collection Process – 2014 - 15
1. Percent of infants and toddlers who receive Early Intervention Services (EIS) in a timely manner	1. Data run of Children with IFSP dates 7/1/2013 to 12/30/2013 by region 2. RC's to review charts of each FSC agency/SPOE send back in spreadsheet which verifies service provided. Target: 100% Results: 95% Best results ever	1. Data run of Children with IFSP dates 7/1/2013 to 12/30/2013 by region 2. RC's to review charts of each FSC agency/SPOE send back in spreadsheet which verifies service provided. Target: 100% Status: Data collection underway—approximately 97%--improved over last year—now best ever result.
2. Percent of infants and toddlers (I/T's) who receive services in home/community based settings	To be collected by Central Office (CO) Target: 98% Results: 97.68% Did not quite meet target	Data collection via EIDS— Target: 98% Status: Results—99%*
3. Percent of infants and toddlers who show improvement in a. positive social emotional skills b. improved knowledge including communication c. use of appropriate behavior to meet needs	a. positive social emotional skills- Targets: SS1-22%, SS2-37% Data collected on 763 children or 22% of children who exited in 2013-14 Actual: *Summary Statement 1—34% *Summary Statement 2—46.9% Exceeded both targets b. improved knowledge including communication Targets: SS1-43.1% SS2-34% Actual: *Summary Statement 1—39.6% *Summary Statement 2—36.4% Did not meet SS1, exceeded SS2 c. use of appropriate behavior to meet needs Targets: SS1-29.6%, SS2-46.2% Actual *Summary Statement 1—27.8% *Summary Statement 2—44.2% Did not meet SS1 or SS2	Analysis of data underway now: a. positive social emotional skills- Targets: SS1-22%, SS2-37%* Actual: Results on 959 Children or 26% of children who exited in 2014-15 Summary Statement 1—31.4%* Summary Statement 2—49.3%* b. improved knowledge including communication Targets: SS1-43.1% SS2-34%* Actual: Summary Statement 1—40.2% Summary Statement 2—40.8%* c. use of appropriate behavior to meet needs Targets: SS1-29.6%, SS2-46.2%* Actual Summary Statement 1—29.6%* Summary Statement 2—46.0%
4. Percent of families who report EIS have helped them a. know their rights	Targets/Performance: a. know their rights—80%/86.43% exceeded target b. Communicate child's needs—84.1%--	Data Collection 1. Written surveys sent out and being returned 2. OCDD surveys underway—analysis

Indicator	Data Collection Process- 2013-14	Data Collection Process – 2014 - 15
b. Communicate child's needs c. help child learn and develop	93%--exceeded target c. help child learn and develop— 91%/93.65%--exceeded target	complete Targets a. know their rights—80% Actual 91%* b. Communicate child's needs---84.2% Actual 97%* c. help child learn and develop—91%-- Actual 93%* Exceeded all three targets—39% response rate
5. Percent of I/T's 0 to 1 with IFSP's compared to: a. other states with similar elig. Criteria b. national data	2013-14 Results—Target 1.17% 12/1/2013 Child Count=718— Met Target	Target—1.20% 12/1/2014 Child Count=752 Increase of 34 children Status: 1.19% Just missed target, no slippage from last year
6. Percent of I/T's , 0-3 with IFSP's compared to a. other similar states b. national data	2013-2014 Results— Child Count = 4145 (increase of 132) Target=2.08% Actual=2.25% Exceeded target	Target = 2.08% 2014-15 Results— Child Count = 4322 (increase of 177) Actual=2.31%* Exceeded target
7. Percent of I/T's with IFSP in 45 day timeline	*Data collection via EIDS Target: 100% 2013-2014- 99%--did not meet target—using family reasons calculation—99.97%.	*Data collection via EIDS Target: 100% 2014-15—99%
8 Percent of children exiting with timely transition a. with IFSP's b. with notice to local ed. Agency c. with transition conference	1. Review all children exiting in March, April, May, 2014 from transition report— Targets: 100% a. with IFSP steps: 100% b. with notice to local ed. Agency—100% c. with transition conference—98.69% Results: Final*	1. Review all children exiting in March, April, May, 2015 from transition report— Targets: 100% a. with IFSP steps: 100%-- met target b. with notice to local ed. Agency: 99.7%-- did not meet target, slight slippage c. with transition conference—96%-- did not meet target, slight slippage
New Indicator 9— 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.	Louisiana will not report on this indicator.	Louisiana will not report on this indicator.
New Indicator 10: Percent of mediations held that resulted in	Louisiana will not report on this indicator as there were no mediations requested in 2013-14. States are not	Louisiana will not report on this indicator as there were no mediations requested in 2014-15. States are not

Indicator	Data Collection Process- 2013-14	Data Collection Process – 2014 - 15
mediation agreements.	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 report in the subsequent APR.	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 report in the subsequent APR.
New Indicator C-11: State Systemic Improvement Plan: SIMR—The EarlySteps system will improve child outcomes through supports that are focused on Family CPRs and provided through a team-based approach	Category d: children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-age peers across all three domain areas = 411 children Category e: Children who maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-age peers across all three domain areas = 562 children Calculation: 963/2289 Baseline data, target and result: 42.5%	Louisiana will be reporting on the SSIP April 2016 Data Collection Description: Category d: children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-age peers across all three domain areas Category e: Children who maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-age peers across all three domain areas Target: 45% Result: 1305/2877 = 45.3%* Remaining work in this indicator will be reported in April, 2016.

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

Executive Summary:

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The Louisiana State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) are developed with broad stakeholder input. Since the passage of the legislation for the early intervention system, the development of the program components in Louisiana has been conducted through stakeholder input and committee/workgroup recommendations through the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). These families, stakeholders and SICC members were also involved in the development and updating of the State Performance Plan in 2005 and 2011 and the Annual Performance reports for FFY 2005 through last year. Committees were formed which included these members, EarlySteps central office staff, regional coordinators, regional quality assurance specialists, and regional EarlySteps Community Outreach Specialists/Parent Liaisons. In addition, central office and regional staff participated in technical assistance telephone conference calls provided by OSEP, the Early Childhood Outcomes conferences and the OSEP leadership conferences. EarlySteps central office staff also participated in technical assistance calls, review of materials, technical assistance meetings, webinars and streaming of live events with the national technical assistance centers and OSEP.

Methods for data collection for performance reporting was collected using the following procedures:

- Desk audits of central data system reports (Early Intervention Data System-EIDS)
- Monitoring by Regional Coordinators and central office staff which included onsite visits and records review
- Technical Assistance and on-site follow up monitoring by Regional Coordinators
- Surveys conducted with families by Community Outreach Specialists

The reporting format for the APR changed in 2013-14 and this year follows the same format:

The Introduction Section which follows provides an overview of the state's Early Intervention structure and the General Supervision System. *General Supervision* describes the process Louisiana uses to oversee its continuous improvement activities including monitoring, quality improvement, and correction of findings. This section includes:

- **A description of the technical assistance and professional development system.**
- **A description of how stakeholders are involved in the development of the SPP and the APR.**
- **Performance Indicator Sections: each indicator section has been updated and includes the following:**
 - **Historical targets and performance results from previous APR reporting periods 2005-2013**
- Targets for 2013 through 2018 were submitted to OSEP in last year's APR submission. No changes to the targets are proposed with the current submission. Performance results against the targets are reported for the 2014-15 reporting period.
 - Explanations of data collection and the performance results including whether the target was reached and whether slippage occurred.

- The status of correction of findings from the previous fiscal year. This was previously reported in the old Indicator 9 which has now been revised and reporting of correction occurs within each indicator.
- Indicator 11: the *State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)* section includes the targets for the SSIP and performance results for 2014-15. The SSIP includes separate documents which will be submitted in April 2016. Included with the separate documents are the sections which are required for Phase II:
 - Infrastructure Development,
 - Support for EIS program and/or EIS provider implementation of evidence-based practices, and
 - Evaluation

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

General Supervision System:

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

Introduction and System Description:

EarlySteps, Louisiana's Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA)-Part C program, is administered by the Department of Health and Hospitals (DHH), Office for Citizens with Developmental Disabilities (OCDD). The lead agency for the program was originally the Louisiana Department of Education. In 2003, the Governor changed the program leadership to the Department of Health and Hospitals, Office of Public Health. In 2007, the leadership was changed to OCDD. OCDD is responsible for managing the developmental disabilities service system for Louisiana which includes Medicaid waiver programs and state-funded supports for persons with developmental disabilities, in addition to the IDEA, Part C program. The Part C service delivery system can be described as an "independent vendor" model of service delivery that includes the following administrative staffing and structure to support its operations:

Central Office has 4 employees: Program Manager, Data Manager, Training Coordinator, and Provider Relations Specialist. These staff coordinate state-level activities, manage contracts, provide oversight and supervision for system implementation and assurances that requirements are met and recommend system changes and improvements.

Regional Operations: There are 9 regional coordinators responsible for the implementation of EarlySteps components in their respective regions. The regional coordinators are responsible for training, technical assistance, provider enrollment and referral source outreach, and components of the general supervision system including complaint investigation, quality assurance, and follow up. Regional coordinators are housed in DHH Human Services District/Authority offices, OCDD regional resource center offices, or in other state agency offices. The main work of the state's technical assistance system is conducted by the regional coordinators and central office staff.

The State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) is coordinated through the Governor's Office of Community Programs and employs an executive director to manage its activities. The SICC members are appointed by the Governor to represent the required constituency groups. The EarlySteps program manager represents OCDD on the SICC. Also representing DHH on the SICC are staff from Medicaid, Maternal Child Health, and Children's Services in the Office of Behavioral Health. In 2008, the SICC and the lead agency developed a joint strategic plan which guides the operations of both the SICC and lead agency. The activities for the Strategic Plan are developed and implemented by staff and

committee members: Comprehensive System of Professional Development (CSPD), Program Components, and Public Relations. Lead agency staff, community outreach specialists, and families, providers and other stakeholders comprise membership of the committees. Committee chairs also represent their committees on the SICC Executive Committee. Ad Hoc committees are appointed by the SICC chair when needed to address specific issues. Examples include a streamlining committee and a fiscal management committee to address specific activities from the Strategic Plan. The SICC and its committees meet quarterly, the SICC Executive Committee meets monthly when the SICC does not meet, and committees may also meet more often as needed. For the purposes of the SSIP work the committees were re-organized into 3 workgroups as outlined in the stakeholder involvement section which follows: Professional Development, Early Childhood Outcomes, and Resource Availability. The workgroup plans comprise the details for the implementation steps and activities as well as the Phase II SSIP evaluation component to be submitted in April, 2016.

Regional Advisory Councils: The SICC structure and function is mirrored at the regional level with regional ICCs (RICCs). The regional coordinators are responsible for coordinating the RICC activities and meetings with regional/local providers, families, agency representatives, providers and other stakeholders. A report of their activities is presented quarterly to the SICC. RICC input flows from the regional level to the SICC for recommendations, input, follow up etc. Information from SICC meetings is also shared at the RICC meetings. The RICCs are part of the state's SSIP communication system for state-regional-local communication and also part of the support mechanism for local implementation.

Quality Assurance Specialists (QAS): There are 10 regional QASs responsible for required QA management located one per each DHH region. A portion of their time is allocated to EarlySteps. The QAS's are responsible for monitoring and reporting associated with the OCDD quality assurance activities through work with the regional coordinator. Regional coordinators facilitate the development of corrective action plans and identification of correction following issuing of findings of noncompliance from monitoring.

10 System Point of Entry Offices (SPOEs)—the SPOEs are contract agencies responsible for intake, eligibility determination, initial service coordination, and the development of the initial IFSP for all referrals and children who become eligible. There is one SPOE contractor for each DHH-OCDD region. The contracts are awarded at least every three years through a competitive RFP process which occurred last in the 2014-2015 fiscal year. One new SPOE contractor was selected resulting from the RFP submissions. SPOE staff consist of a program director, intake coordinators and an early intervention consultant. Following the development of the initial IFSP, the SPOE intake coordinators assist families with provider and family support coordinator selection for the implementation of the IFSP. Subsequent activities are managed by the IFSP teams consisting of providers, families, and a support coordinator. SPOEs have the ongoing responsibility for data entry into the Early Intervention Data System (EIDS) managed by the Central Finance Office contractor and for maintenance of the early intervention records.

1 Central Finance Office (CFO) contractor—who provides the following system supports: provider enrollment and maintenance, claims processing and payment for non-Medicaid-paid services and/or services for children who are not Medicaid eligible, and the maintenance of the "central service directory" or service matrix. The CFO is responsible for EIDS management and works with the lead agency to meet data reporting needs. Included in their operations with Medicaid is a monthly eligibility verification batch file submission to Medicaid's fiscal intermediary (FI) to accurately identify Medicaid-eligible children so that the appropriate fund source can be billed. From the eligibility data, an additional file is submitted daily to the FI to issue prior authorizations for support coordination services. The CFO issues all support coordination and services authorizations following IFSP meetings. The CFO contract is awarded at least every three years through a competitive RFP process. A new 3-year contract with the current contractor is proposed for 2015-2018.

9 Community Outreach Specialists (COSs) and 1 COS State Liaison through contracts with Families Helping Families and Southeast Louisiana Area Health Education Center (AHEC). COSs are parents/family members of children with disabilities who provide parent-to-parent support and conduct outreach for EarlySteps. The COSs provide family support for approximately 20 hours per week, the state liaison is full time.

Provider Affiliation Agreements are completed for individual and agency service providers and support coordination agencies enrolled in the system. There are approximately 800 providers enrolled in the system statewide.

General Supervision System

FFY 2014 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The administrative structure described above supports the general supervision activities in EarlySteps: OCDD uses a continuous quality improvement (CQI) model for the developmental disabilities service system and this serves as the framework for the system of general supervision for IDEA, Part C implementation.

The components for this model are based on these components: *plan, do, check, act* which outline the framework for the general supervision system as follows:

The "*plan*" phase incorporates the components of the SPP/APR that involve preparation for the plan, stakeholder input, identifying data sources and collecting baseline and other performance data, setting targets, budgeting for system activities, strategic planning to identify improvement strategies, determining staff responsibilities for implementing the plan and identifying professional development needs. All staff, the SICC, and stakeholders are involved in this phase of the process. Central office staff compile data, make recommendations, and report results to present to and receive feedback from stakeholders prior to annual APR submission to OSEP.

The "*do*" phase incorporates training/professional development, communication flow, policy development and implementation, memoranda of understanding and interagency agreements, and the implementation of the strategic plan action items/improvement strategies. Central office staff and the SICC Executive Director provide the administrative oversight of the implementation activities such as contract development. The actual "implementation" of system components occurs at the regional and local levels through the SPOEs and providers. The regional coordinators have the responsibility to oversee implementation at the local/regional level. This phase incorporates the professional development components of the system and includes setting provider credentials and qualifications. The activities of professional development are managed through central office staff with support from the SICC CSPD committee.

The "*check*" phase includes the "monitoring" components of the system which include all of the following: agency/provider onsite monitoring, EIDS reporting review, chart review, family surveys/interviews, fiscal management/monitoring, and the dispute resolution system. This phase also involves staff, providers and stakeholders at all levels. Central office staff guide report development and set timelines for monitoring, regional staff are responsible for the monitoring activities and analysis of results. Central office staff aggregate performance results to present and receive feedback from stakeholders. The SICC committees and stakeholders are responsible for reviewing and updating the strategic plan activities based on performance results or other identified issues. The dispute resolution system is managed primarily by regional staff. Complaints are responded to by the regional coordinator and entered into OCDD's complaint management system. This system assists with generating responses and correspondence to the complainant and with tracking timelines for resolution. Complaint tracking is reviewed at the central office level. The Division of Administrative Law is responsible for dispute resolution if mediation or a due process hearing is requested.

The "*act*" phase is the component which responds to the other phases based on the results of their components. This phase includes development, implementation of, and follow up with corrective action plans; determinations, public reporting of performance results, enforcement of requirements, revising policy and strategies based on performance and system needs/changes, and developing pilot activities. These activities occur at all levels of the system as well. Regional staff are responsible for follow up with monitoring findings to ensure correction and at the central office level, staff review results and review correction, issue determinations, enforce sanctions and, and recommend revisions to the improvement process. SICC committees will recommend improvement strategies based on performance results or complaints.

Use of this CQI model to support Louisiana's general supervision system has proven to be effective in improving the state's performance results since 2007. It is an integrated model which is informed by data, responsive to stakeholder input, and based on the assumption that improvement is ongoing and continuous.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to

early intervention service (EIS) programs.

Technical Assistance System

As mentioned in the general supervision system description section above, the EarlySteps technical assistance (TA) system is a component of its General Supervision system. The infrastructure which supports the TA system relies strongly on the support provided by the regional staff. EarlySteps' TA model has traditionally relied on on-line training modules and face-to-face training with follow up TA provided by the regional coordinators. TA activities might include initial system training following completion of the online modules with new provider/agency enrollment. The regional coordinators have a standard orientation module used for this purpose. The module requires a series of scheduled contacts with the agency/provider covering certain content with built-in follow up activities. When new policies, etc. are forthcoming, regional staff are responsible for coordinating the implementation and conducting monitoring to ensure that implementation occurs as intended. Follow up after monitoring, to ensure effective implementation after noncompliance or other issues are identified, is also the responsibility of regional coordinators. Regional staff are responsible for information sharing at RICC meetings and through email listservs. This TA model is the basis of support planned for systems improvement with the SSIP.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

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

Professional Development System

The EarlySteps professional development system is designed to operate hand-in-hand with the TA system. As a component of the general supervision system, it is designed to be responsive to identified provider/agency/family needs, to inform the system when new procedures and policies are required, to address practice change to improve child and family outcomes and to implement evidence-based practices. The system includes entry level online training modules, information sharing and resource sharing, posting information on the EarlySteps website, and information and training for families, face-to-face professional development activities provided through contracted trainers who work with central office staff and the CSPD committee to develop training modules based on system needs. Follow up TA after training is then provided by regional staff. The SSIP professional development workgroup has, as its major focus for the SSIP, to propose a framework for improving the state's PD system,

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

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

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

Stakeholder Involvement

Stakeholder involvement has always been a strong, valued component of Louisiana's early intervention system. This involvement began during the planning years of "Part H" under the LDOE at the time, when SICC committees were formed to assist the lead agency in the design of what has evolved to become the current early intervention system. Although the focus

of the committees has changed over time, their work has continued to contribute to changing needs and to system improvement. At Strategic Planning sessions, the focus and roles of the committees is always reviewed when the system strategic directions are identified. The focus on and value of stakeholder involvement continues under the leadership of OCDD.

As part of the administrative transition of EarlySteps from the DHH Office of Public Health to OCDD in 2007, a program evaluation was conducted resulting in a Lead Agency improvement plan. The description for this process and resulting improvement activities from the implementation plan were reported in the previous State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Reports. At that time, the lead agency worked from its own improvement workplan and the SICC had its Strategic Plan to guide its work. In 2008, the lead agency and the SICC agreed to develop the state's first aligned Strategic Plan to coordinate their quality improvement efforts. The process to develop the Plan included:

- Forming an SICC ad hoc workgroup that included the ICC executive director, lead agency staff, and the EarlySteps State COS Liaison. The workgroup members developed the process by which the plan would be developed and reported their activities monthly to the ICC Executive Committee.
- Conducting focus groups with stakeholders in May, 2008. A process for facilitating focus group discussion was developed by the workgroup so that a standardized process would be used across the DHH regions. Regional Coordinators and COSs participated in training to implement the process and nine regional focus groups were conducted. The information gathered from the focus groups was used to frame the strategic planning discussion.
- Holding a Strategic Plan retreat in June, 2008. The workgroup assembled stakeholders representing families, SICC and RICC members, lead agency staff, providers, and others to develop the plan, including developing a vision and focus areas. Each focus area had at least one goal and several action steps needed to accomplish the goal. SICC committees were re-organized based on the newly identified focus areas and action steps were formulated by committees to address goals.
- Presenting the Plan to the SICC. The plan was reviewed and approved by the SICC for the 2008-2011 period. This was the first time that the SICC and lead agency were jointly working on system improvement activities. Through this process the SICC executive director, lead agency, and committee chairs could report on their activities in an aligned, focused manner.
- In 2011, the SICC Executive Committee agreed to conduct a planning meeting to revisit and update the Strategic Plan. Regional "listening sessions" were held and facilitated using a similar format to solicit stakeholder input. The information was compiled to present at a Strategic Planning retreat in May, 2011. Grace Kelley with SERRC facilitated the meeting using the Technology of Participation model. Approximately 35 stakeholders participated and developed a vision and three strategic directions to guide the state's work: Improving the System, Enhancing Services and Accountability, and Improving Efficiency and Access. Each Strategic Direction had three to four goals and several action steps. The goals were aligned with APR Performance Indicators and other state quality initiatives. Committees were re-aligned to accomplish the work: Program Components, CSPD, and Public Relations.
- The Strategic Directions and Strategic Plan for 2011 through 2014 were presented to and approved by the SICC at its July 2011 meeting. The plan included the implementation activities planned for the SICC, the lead agency, and the SICC committees for the 3-year period. The plan not only directed the program activities planned for the period, but also guided improvement strategies which the lead agency incorporated into its SPP/APR improvement activities.
- When OSEP proposed the new SPP-APR process in 2013 including Indicator C-11, the SICC voted at its July, 2013 meeting to re-visit the Strategic Plan for the purpose of updating it and to use it as the framework for the preparation for the Statewide System Improvement Plan (SSIP).

Describing the history of Louisiana's Strategic Planning process is important to show the ongoing focus on continuous improvement held by the system as well as the contributions of its stakeholders. The result of this jointly developed and implemented strategic plan is that Louisiana has coordinated its activities to support improvement developed and provided through stakeholder involvement since 2008. This strategic plan, the results of the APR performance and other state data are used to inform improvement planning for EarlySteps each year. As with SSIP development, as data results are reviewed, improvement activities are recommended to the lead agency and incorporated into the committee/workgroup plans through the Strategic Plan implementation. More information regarding the ongoing contributions of stakeholders in the development and implementation of the SSIP will be updated in the Indicator C-11 Phase II analysis due in April, 2016.

The Louisiana State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report were developed with the broad stakeholder input described above. Since the passage of the legislation for the early intervention system (EIS), the development of the Part C program components has been conducted through stakeholder input and the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) committee recommendations [Public Relations (PR), Program Components, and Comprehensive System of Personnel

FFY 2014 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Development (CSPD)]. Committees meet at least quarterly prior to SICC meetings. These family members, stakeholders, lead agency staff and SICC members were also involved in the development and update of the State Performance Plan (SPP) in 2005 and 2010 and the Annual Performance reports for Federal Fiscal Years (FFYs) 2005 through 2012. Committees were formed which included these members, providers, EarlySteps central office staff, regional coordinators, regional quality assurance specialists, and regional COSs for the development of the SPP and APR. EarlySteps regional staff also solicit input and provide reports to the nine regional ICCs which meet at least quarterly.

An update on the contributions of stakeholders in the development of the SSIP will be forthcoming in the Indicator C-11 Phase II analysis due by April, 2016. The description will also include the process used to meet the Phase II requirements. The 2016 SICC certification statement is attached.

Attachments

File Name

Uploaded By

Uploaded Date

No APR attachments found.

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2012 performance of each EIS Program or Provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2012 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2012 APR in 2014, is available.

Reporting to the Public

Data results for the APR are reported monthly from September through January each year to the SICC Executive Committee and/or at SICC meetings as soon as performance results are available for the APR reporting period. The APR Monthly Report is disseminated at these meetings and then distributed through the SICC listserv. The regional coordinators also distribute the report at their quarterly regional ICC meetings. Once the APR results are complete and final, an Executive Summary is shared with the SICC at its January meeting and distributed via the listserv and Regional Interagency Coordinating Council (RICC) meetings. The Executive Summary includes the link to the full report. The SICC certification statement is completed at the January SICC meeting. The APR, revised SPP, and local performance reports are posted on the state's website in February each year. OSEP's response to the APR and the annual determination are shared in the same fashion. These are posted to <http://www.earlysteps.dhh.louisiana.gov>. The SICC Executive Director also provides the APR to the Governor to meet the requirement for the SICC Annual Report.

Attachments

File Name

Uploaded By

Uploaded Date

Remove

[sicc certification 2016.pdf](#)

Brenda Sharp

R
e
m
o
v
e

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 1: Timely provision of services**Historical Data and Targets***Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments***Compliance indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.


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

Historical Data*Baseline Data: 2005*

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		50.00%	85.00%	86.00%	87.60%	90.70%	93.80%	91.20%	91.00%	95.45%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key:  Blue – Data Update

therefore, is a combination of state database and from state monitoring.

☐ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 1: Timely provision of services

Required Actions from FFY 2013

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response	
Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings	

Indicator 1: Timely provision of services**Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance***Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments*

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
32	32	0	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected*Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

In FY 2013-14, 32 findings of noncompliance were issued. Twenty-two findings were issued to 22 FSC agencies for services not provided within 30 days of parent consent for the IFSP. As of the February 2015 APR submission, these findings were under corrective action plans (CAPs). Following completion of the CAPs, the regional coordinators conducted follow up monitoring and the 22 findings were verified as corrected as follows:

1. The agencies for which findings were issued in 2013-14 are correctly implementing the timely services requirement at 100% for services provided within 30 days of the IFSP as verified by monitoring and data review of service delivery for each child reviewed within the subsequent quarter following the completion of the CAP.
2. Each finding of noncompliance was corrected for each individual child for whom services were late. The services were received by the child, although late.

In addition, there were 10 findings for Indicator 1 from complaints. These complaints were related to services being provided as authorized by the IFSP. These 10 findings were corrected timely as reported in the February, 2015 APR.

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

Louisiana uses an EIDS data report to generate data for reporting on this indicator. The query used for the report provides IFSPs written for the 1st quarter of 2014 and service data for 6 months. Through data review, it was verified, that for any child for whom services did not start within 30 days of parent consent for the IFSP, that the service was provided, although late.

Louisiana is providing the status of all findings for FFY 2013-14 in the attached worksheet. The State is using the previously required C-9 Worksheet to outline, indicator by indicator, the findings of noncompliance for each indicator, including complaints, and the status of correction within 1 year. A description of the correction, and the status of each finding and complaint is also outlined in the narrative in each indication section related to the finding.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None		

--	--

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%
Data		98.60%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	97.40%	97.68%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%

Key:  Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder involvement in the development of data collection for Indicator 2 and in target setting is described in the Introduction section of the APR. No changes in targets are proposed based on work conducted during Phase II data reviews/discussions.

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

FFY 2014 Data

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)

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	<u>Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings</u>	4,268	
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	<u>Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs</u>	4,278	

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
4,268	4,278	97.68%	98.00%	99.77%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Louisiana's EIDS is used to collect data for this indicator. Service settings are determined as part of the IFSP process and are entered by the System Points of Entry offices (SPOEs) following the submission of the IFSP. An EIDS report can be generated to review settings for APR reporting and policy compliance.

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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)

Actions required in FFY 2013 response	
<div>None</div>	
Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response	
<div>Louisiana is reporting progress data on actual target data for FFY 2014-15 as required in the FFY 2013 Results Data Summary Notes (check this)</div>	

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes**Historical Data and Targets**

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

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


Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A1	2008	Target ≥						20.50%	21.50%	22.00%		22.00%
		Data					20.10%	23.10%	17.00%	20.00%	24.70%	34.02%
A2	2008	Target ≥						32.90%	33.90%	34.00%		37.00%
		Data					32.40%	46.50%	36.20%	44.40%	44.50%	46.92%
B1	2008	Target ≥						43.10%	44.10%	45.00%		43.10%
		Data					42.60%	33.90%	30.00%	30.20%	30.00%	39.60%
B2	2008	Target ≥						29.40%	30.40%	33.00%		34.00%
		Data					28.90%	39.30%	34.50%	37.50%	34.70%	36.44%
C1	2008	Target ≥						29.60%	30.60%	32.00%		29.60%
		Data					29.10%	19.00%	22.00%	21.50%	25.60%	27.84%
C2	2008	Target ≥						46.20%	47.20%	48.00%		46.20%
		Data					45.70%	38.00%	40.30%	40.80%	39.50%	44.17%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	22.00%	22.00%	22.00%	22.00%	22.00%
Target A2 ≥	37.00%	37.00%	37.00%	37.00%	37.00%
Target B1 ≥	43.10%	43.10%	43.10%	43.10%	43.10%
Target B2 ≥	34.00%	34.00%	34.00%	34.00%	34.00%
Target C1 ≥	29.60%	29.60%	29.60%	29.60%	29.60%
Target C2 ≥	46.20%	46.20%	46.20%	46.20%	46.20%

Key:  Blue – Data Update

Explanation of Changes

The target data for FFY 2018 did not show in the above table. The target was added back in, but has not been revised by the state.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder involvement in the development of data collection and in target setting for Indicator 3 is described in the Introduction Section of the APR. Following the data analysis review from Phase I SSIP planning, child outcomes were determined to be a priority for the SSIP and a workgroup was established to address the identified areas of concern. Changes to the data collection and reporting process are anticipated as a major activity of the SSIP under the leadership of Louisiana's SICC Early Childhood Outcomes Workgroup. More details on the target setting, stakeholder involvement, and other change activities recommended by stakeholders and the workgroup were provided in the Indicator C-11 SSIP submitted in April, 2015. The Early Childhood Outcomes workgroup has prepared recommendations for changes based on pilot data from their Phase II work. The data analysis indicates that with the recommended process, Louisiana's child outcome data will be more in line with national data. Additional data analysis, the improvement strategies to address the workplan, and the recommendations for changes to the measurement process will be submitted in the Phase II SSIP report to be submitted in April, 2016.

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

FFY 2014 Data

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)

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	959.00
--	--------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	421.00	43.90%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	24.00	2.50%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	41.00	4.28%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	163.00	17.00%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	310.00	32.33%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 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 $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	204.00	649.00	34.02%	22.00%	31.43%	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 $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	473.00	959.00	46.92%	37.00%	49.32%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	402.00	41.92%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	66.00	6.88%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	100.00	10.43%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	214.00	22.31%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	177.00	18.46%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 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	314.00	782.00	39.60%	43.10%	40.15%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).							
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	391.00	959.00	36.44%	34.00%	40.77%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	460.00	47.97%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	29.00	3.02%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	29.00	3.02%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	177.00	18.46%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	264.00	27.53%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 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 (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	206.00	695.00	27.84%	29.60%	29.64%	Met Target	No 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 (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	441.00	959.00	44.17%	46.20%	45.99%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? No
Provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" and list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

As discussed in prior-year APRs, with the transition of EarlySteps to OCDD, the BDI-2 was selected as the sole tool for eligibility determination and outcome measurement. An EIDS system modification was made to accommodate entry of BDI-2 entry and exit outcome scores by the SPOEs. The results of the initial evaluation of a child at entry are entered into EIDS and are used for the entry scores. An exit BDI-2 is administered at the exit of the child from early intervention. For children who have been in early intervention for at least 6 months, entry and exit scores are compared for outcome reporting.

The process for categorizing entry and exit scores to place children in OSEP's categories a. through e. is summarized as follows:

- Entry and exit data was collected for children exiting from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015 who had been in the system for a minimum of 6 months. Complete entry and exit scores were collected on 959 children, a 27% increase from last year.

Children were considered to be functioning at a level *below same-age peers* if the standard score for the domain was below 78 or if the z-score was greater than -1.47. These scores were chosen because they are

commensurate with the eligibility criteria for Louisiana of 1.5 standard deviations below the mean. Scores at or below 80 or a z-score less than -1.47 and at or greater than -1.33 were considered to be *a level nearer to same-age peers*. Standard scores above 80 or a z-score less than -1.33 are considered to be *comparable to same age peers*. This distinction recognizes that children may not qualify for EarlySteps services but may still be functioning below typically developing peers. According to the *BDI-2 Examiner's Manual* (page 74), children with standard scores below 80 (but above the 78 cut off for EarlySteps) fall into a mild developmental delay category.

- Exit assessment is defined at the latest BDI-2 administered for annual eligibility determination or the "exit outcomes assessment" prior to the child's exit during 2014-15. The child must have been in the program for 6 months.
- The BDI-2 developmental domains were utilized for reporting as follows:
 1. The Personal-Social Domain was used to report "positive social-emotional skills, including social relationships."
 2. The Communication Domain was used to report "acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)."
 3. The Motor Domain was used to report the "use of appropriate behavior to meet needs."
 4. The process for determining progress and placing a child in one of the five OSEP reporting categories was taken from the ECO Center report referenced above and applied as follows:
 - a. Children in this reporting category either acquired no new skills or behaviors, or their level of functioning regressed between entry and exit. Category a. includes children whose exit scores were at or below their entry score, regardless of whether they were functioning typically at entry or not.
 - b. Children in this category improved functioning, but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-age peers. These children had improved exit scores and had a standard score between 78 and 80 and a z-score of -1.47 to -1.33, placing them out of the eligibility score for EarlySteps but still within "mild developmental delay" category according to the BDI-2.
 - c. Children in this category entered below typical peers; their exit scores were improved from their entry score but they exited below "typical" or with less than a standard score of 78 or z-score of -1.47 for that developmental domain. Scores in this category would generally indicate continuing eligibility for EarlySteps.
 - d. Children in this category entered below typical peers; their exit scores were improved with a standard score at or greater than 80 at exit indicating improvement to a level comparable to same-age peers.
 - e. Children in this category entered at or above their same-age peers, with standard scores of 80, who showed improvement at exit with standard scores above 80.

For the 2014-15 reporting period, the EIDS data report was used to report on child outcomes. Data was reviewed for all children for whom the BDI-2 entry and exit data was available, who exited the system between July 1, 2014 and June 30, 2015 who were in the system for a minimum of 6 months. The same methodology used to place children in progress categories a-e last year was applied for this reporting period. The indicator C-11 SSIP to be submitted in April, 2016 will include the coherent improvement strategies intended to improve child outcome data collection, analysis and results for this Indicator.

 Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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)

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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


Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2006	Target ≥			74.00%	75.00%	76.00%	77.00%	78.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
		Data			78.00%	64.00%	78.00%	81.50%	72.00%	74.00%	76.80%	86.43%
B	2006	Target ≥			72.00%	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%	80.00%	80.00%	84.10%
		Data			84.00%	80.00%	89.00%	91.40%	83.00%	88.00%	93.50%	93.70%
C	2006	Target ≥			86.00%	87.00%	88.00%	89.00%	90.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%
		Data			81.00%	85.00%	91.00%	88.40%	87.00%	91.00%	83.80%	93.65%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Target B ≥	84.20%	84.30%	84.30%	85.00%	85.10%
Target C ≥	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%

Key:  Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder involvement in the development of data collection and target setting for Indicator 4 is described in the Introduction Section of the APR. More detail regarding stakeholders and target setting for all indicators will also be provided in the Indicator C-11 SSIP description submitted in April, 2016. In 2013, the EarlySteps Community Outreach Specialists (COSs) reviewed the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center, *Family Outcomes Survey, Revised Version*, and selected this survey for use for the mailed surveys to which families responded. Prior to this time, the original version of the ECO *Family Outcomes Survey* was used in Louisiana. Additional State-developed questions were added to the revised survey for 2014-15. The revisions to the survey are intended to capture items related to the state's State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR): *the EarlySteps system will improve child outcomes through supports that are focused on family concerns, priorities, and resources and provided through a team-based approach.* These questions are listed below in italics. The information below describes the process used with the survey and the additional questions. The survey questions were re-numbered for ease of tracking. The survey is attached.

The *Family Outcomes Survey, Revised Version* uses a 5 item rating scale. EarlySteps considers a response of "Somewhat helpful" or better as the criteria for determining if early intervention services "helped/describes their family."

A. Know their rights

EarlySteps continued the following questions for this survey area. The items were:

- We know who to contact and what to do when we have questions or concerns.
- How helpful has early intervention been in giving you useful information about your rights related to your child's special needs?
- How helpful has early intervention been in explaining your rights in ways that are easy to understand?

B. Effectively communicate their child's needs

For this area, EarlySteps selected the questions below. For 2014-15, an additional question was added to the survey in this section to assess the use of family assessment in developing IFSPs:

- We understand our child's strengths and abilities
- How helpful has early intervention been in connecting you with other community supports, resources or people who can help your child and family
- *How helpful has early intervention been in talking with you about your family's strengths and needs as identified through the Concerns, Priorities, Resources (CPR) process*
- *State-Added Question: How helpful has early intervention been in helping your family understand the importance of your input in the Concerns, Priorities, and Resources (CPR) planning process?*

C. Help their child develop and learn

Early Steps selected the following questions to address this area.

- *We are able to work on our child's outcomes as identified on the IFSP during daily routines when the provider is not with us*
- How helpful has early intervention been in giving you useful information about how to help your child learn new skills
- *How helpful has early intervention been in working with you to help you use intervention strategies to address IFSP outcomes that were identified through the Concerns Priorities Resources (CPR) process?*
- *How helpful has early intervention been in sharing ideas on how to include your child in daily activities to address IFSP outcomes?*

A copy of the survey is attached, revisions designated in italics above.

Indicator 4: Family Involvement**FFY 2014 Data**

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)

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent families participating in Part C	239.00
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	531.00
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	584.00
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	711.00
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	732.00
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	705.00
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	760.00

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	86.43%	80.00%	90.92%	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	93.70%	84.20%	97.13%	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	93.65%	91.00%	92.76%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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

Data for Indicator 4 was collected through two survey procedures in FFY 2014, using both census and sampling methods.

For Methodology 1, *The Early Childhood Outcomes Center-Family Outcomes Survey, Part C Revised Version* was utilized to collect information for Indicator 4 for this reporting period, with State-added questions.

Surveys were mailed to all families (536 families) whose children exited EarlySteps in the months of April, May, and June 2015. Completed surveys were received from 167 families or 31% of the mail-survey families. The surveys were mailed and coded to identify the region of the respondent. Additional demographic information was added for the families to identify their children's gender, length of time in EarlySteps, and their eligibility for Medicaid as a general indicator of income. The regional distribution of the total EarlySteps population is compared with the regional distribution of the surveyed families. The distributions are similar with the exception of region 1 which was over-represented and regions 3 and 9 which were underrepresented. There was a problem with the receiving the surveys from region 3, so all but

4 surveys were discounted from region 3:

Region	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
EarlySteps Total	8.9%	13.4%	11%	11%	4.4%	4.7%	10.6%	10.4%	15.3%	9.6%	99.3%
Method 1 Survey Distribution	6.5%	16%	13%	9%	4%	5%	14.5%	9.5%	15%	7.4%	99.9%
Method 1 Survey Responses	21%	14%	1%	6.5%	7%	6.5%	6%	10%	19%	9%	100%
Method 2 OCDD Survey	3%	12%	9%	22%	10%	7%	10%	4%	16%	6%	99%

Responding families indicated that 69% of the children were male and 31% were female, compared to the distribution of all children who exited in 2014 as 64.3% male and 35.7% female. Seventy-three percent of the responding families indicated that their child received Medicaid. The average Medicaid enrollment in EarlySteps in 2014-5 was approximately 60%. Parents reported their child's average time in EarlySteps as follows:

- 17(10%) respondent's children had been in EarlySteps for less than 6 months
- 24(15%) children had been in EarlySteps for 6 months to 1 year
- 38 (23%) children had been in EarlySteps for 1 to 2 years
- 84 (52%) children had been in EarlySteps greater than 2 years

For Methodology 2, EarlySteps families also participated in consumer surveys conducted by OCDD for this reporting period in four aspects of the National Core Indicators (NCI) project for 2014. The Consumer Surveys (interviews) were conducted across the 10 OCDD Developmental Disabilities service areas.

Three mail-out surveys (Children/Family, Adult/Family and Family/Guardian, as appropriate) were mailed to OCDD services participants, of which 78 were EarlySteps families. The sample drawn represents the distribution of race, ethnicity, and gender of the total EarlySteps population based on the EarlySteps population data from the OSEP Table 3 Exiting 618 data as reported in earlier APRs. The geographic distribution is also shown on the chart above.

Responses were obtained for 72 EarlySteps families with this methodology or 1.7% of the EarlySteps population. The chart above shows the regional distribution of responses compared to the total EarlySteps population and the results indicate that regions 1 and 8 were underrepresented and regions 4 and 5 were overrepresented.

For the past 2-3 years a third methodology, an electronic survey was posted on the EarlySteps website. Due to the low participation rate with this method, the survey was removed and not used for this reporting period for 2014-15, but may be revisited for use in the future.

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? Yes



Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State



No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

Submitted collection tool: No Collection Tool Submitted

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

As stated above, 2 methods are used for collecting data for Indicator 4. The second method uses a sampling plan approved by OSEP in the previous SPP/APR period which has not changed. The office selects participants using the geographic distribution data from EIDS as well as the demographic data from 618 reporting. Samples are drawn from the EIDS data to represent the numbers sampled per region, age, race and gender of the enrolled population. As a result, although the response rate is low, is felt to represent the population of EarlySteps-enrolled children.



Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In 2013-14, 7 findings of noncompliance for Indicator 4 were issued from complaints. These complaints involved issues related to confidentiality and consent for services. For these complaints, providers and/or FSC agencies were placed under corrective action and families selected other providers. The complaints were all resolved timely. The Indicator C-9 worksheet attached in the Indicator 1 section shows the status of the findings.

Indicator 4: Family Involvement
Required Actions from FFY 2013

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments
Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Actions required in FFY 2013 response	
Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings	

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)**Historical Data and Targets***Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find***Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.**

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

Historical Data*Baseline Data: 2013*

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			1.25%	1.30%	1.35%	1.40%	1.45%	1.50%	1.50%	1.17%
Data		1.79%	0.85%	1.27%	1.46%	1.56%	1.64%	1.92%	1.82%	1.17%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	1.20%	1.30%	1.40%	1.50%	1.50%

Key:  Blue – Data Update**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholder involvement in the development of data collection and in target setting for Indicator 5 is described in the Introduction Section of the APR. No changes to targets were proposed as a result of the Phase II work.

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

FFY 2014 Data

*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)

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	<u>Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs</u>	736	null
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013	4/3/2014	<u>Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1</u>	61,601	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
736	61,601	1.17%	1.20%	1.19%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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)

Actions required in FFY 2013 response	
Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response	

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)**Historical Data and Targets***Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find***Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.**

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

Historical Data*Baseline Data: 2005*

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			2.45%	2.50%	2.55%	2.60%	2.65%	2.65%	2.65%	2.08%
Data		1.76%	1.27%	1.78%	2.03%	2.27%	2.50%	2.72%	2.13%	2.25%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	2.08%	2.08%	2.08%	2.08%	2.08%

Key:  Blue – Data Update**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholder involvement in the development of data collection and in target setting for Indicator 6 is described in the Introduction Section of the APR. More detail regarding stakeholder involvement and target setting for all indicators was provided in the Indicator C-11 SSIP submitted in April, 2015. No changes to targets were proposed resulting from Phase II work.

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

FFY 2014 Data

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)

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	<u>Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs</u>	4,278	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013	7/2/2015	<u>Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3</u>	185,046	

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
4,278	185,046	2.25%	2.08%	2.31%

Status

Slippage

Met Target

No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

☐ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)
Required Actions from FFY 2013

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)

Actions required in FFY 2013 response	
Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response	

Indicator 7: 45-day timeline**Historical Data and Targets***Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find***Compliance indicator:** Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

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

Historical Data*Baseline Data: 2005*

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		95.02%	91.00%	96.00%	97.50%	99.40%	99.70%	99.90%	98.20%	99.97%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key:  Blue – Data Update

Indicator 7: 45-day timeline
FFY 2014 Data

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)

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
4,088	4,143	99.97%	100%	99.98%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.						
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)						54

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

- ☒ State monitoring
- ☒ State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

The EIDS data report, Average Days for Referral to IFSP, for the fiscal year period 7/1/2014-6/30/2015 was used for data collection. I total of 4,143 initial IFSPs were written following referral and counted for reporting.

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

The EIDS was used to collect and analyze data for Indicator 7. This report generates a list of every initial IFSP written during the fiscal year. The 45-day timeline from referral to IFSP was analyzed for each system point of entry office in the State for the fiscal year and included all of the IFSPs written in the reporting period. A total of 4,143 initial IFSPs were written with 4,088 meeting the 45-day timeline. The results represent all geographic areas of the State in all SPOE regions for all children. The EIDS report also provided the reasons for IFSP delays. The system calculates the number of days from referral to IFSP based upon the referral dates entered. Following referral, when the SPOE enters an IFSP date and if the 45th day has passed, the date triggers a window in which the SPOE must enter a reason for delay. Choices for entry related to delay reasons include: none, child deceased, child illness/hospitalization, family requests delay, family response time, system delay. SPOEs are able to run reports to check referral to IFSP timelines, and they report this in the monthly self-assessment submitted to EarlySteps central office. Central office is able to run a report for all SPOEs and compare with what has been submitted. Reasons for delay can also be identified in the EIDS report. Analysis of the reasons for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSPs indicates that 54 IFSPs were late due to family reasons such as a child's illness or hospitalization,

response time by the family and family request. There was 1 remaining late IFSP due to "system delay" for the following: scheduling conflict. In this case, the report indicates that the meeting date occurred, although late.

Results indicate very slightly improved performance from FFY 2013-2014.

For 2014-15, one SPOE was issued a finding for the system delay resulting from one IFSP that was delayed until 46 days and occurring during the third quarter of the reporting period. To establish correction, IFSP timelines for this SPOE were reviewed for the subsequent two quarters of resulting in correction of the noncompliance with 100% of the IFSPs in this review period met the 45-day timeline.

The average number of days for IFSP completion for the ten SPOEs during the reporting period analyzed was 34.1 days, the minimum was 1 day and the maximum was 59 days (family reason). As a quality assurance review, the regional coordinators reviewed SPOE charts for all children in their region for whom the delay was due to family reasons. The purpose for the review was to verify that chart documentation supported the reason for delay as due to family reasons. Results of the review indicated that SPOE documentation verified that the delays were due to family circumstances.

☐ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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)

Actions required in FFY 2013 response	
Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings	

Indicator 7: 45-day timeline**Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance***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)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected*Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

For 2013-14 one SPOE was issued a finding for "system delay" resulting from one IFSP that was delayed following referral for 49 days during the 3rd quarter of the reporting period. To establish correction, IFSP timelines for this SPOE were reviewed for the subsequent two quarters resulting in verification that 100% of the IFSPs met the 45-day timeline.

In addition, in 2013-2014, there were 2 complaints related to Indicator 7. Both complaints were resolved timely.

To verify correction following corrective action, the state verified that

1. the SPOE/agency is meeting the 45-day timeline for initial IFSPs with 100% compliance and that,
2. the agency developed an IFSP, although late, for the child whose IFSP exceeded 45 days as verified by State review.

For 2014-15, one finding was issued for a system delay reason in one SPOE. The finding was subsequently corrected.

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

The EIDS report lists each child for whom and initial IFSP is developed following the initial evaluation for eligible children. The report lists the number of days from referral to IFSP and the reason for delay if any. If a child's IFSP exceeds the 45-day time, the reason for delay can be verified from the report. Louisiana can verify that the noncompliance was corrected through data review as described above

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None		

Indicator 8: Early Childhood Transition

FFY 2014 Data: All Indicator 8 Sections

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)

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	3,606
Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	1,466

☐ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition**Historical Data and Targets**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		86.00%	93.00%	94.00%	94.50%	99.60%	100%	97.20%	99.20%	100%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

The EIDS transition report generates the list of all children exiting during the target months. Chart review is then conducted for data collection for Indicators 8a and 8c by regional coordinators using a standard review tool. Transition conference dates are verified as occurring for birthdates 2 years, 2 months to 2 years, 9 months (census data). Chart review of FSC agency charts was then conducted for all children exiting in March, April, and May, 2015--a total of 587 children, representing 16.3% of all children exiting Part C or 40% of the children exiting who were Part B eligible. The review tool used by regional coordinators requires them to indicate the status of the child's transition after contacting the LEA or parent. Therefore, even if performance is less than 100% for an agency, the child's transition status is verified through the review. All 32 family support coordination agencies had charts reviewed for the time period.

☐ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition
Required Actions from FFY 2013

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)

Actions required in FFY 2013 response	
Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings	

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

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)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition**Historical Data and Targets***Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition***Compliance indicator:** The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

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

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

Historical Data*Baseline Data: 2005*

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

FFY 2014 Data

*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)

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
Indicator 8	1/18/2016	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	1,466	1,994

Explanation of Alternate Data

For notification to the SEA and LEA, the data provided through a central reporting process using EIDS. This process is described in Louisiana's February, 2007 APR. In this process, a monthly data report of all active children at least age 2 years, 2 months through 3 years of age is sent to the LDOE. The appropriate LDOE contacts acknowledge receipt of the list. Performance for this indicator has typically reported as 100%, since 100% of the active children within the age ranges is sent to the LDOE to meet timeline requirements. The numbers sent each month vary as the ages of the children change monthly. An average of 1,994 names per month was submitted to the LDOE and is used as the calculation number shown above. The section below provides details regarding data analysis and results for this indicator for 2014-2015.

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
1,926	1,994	100%	100%	96.59%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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 when calculating the FFY 2014 Data)	0
---	---

Explanation of Slippage

This year, there was a data system failure affecting the December, 2014 and January, 2015 reports resulting in late and/or missing data for those 2 months. For the December and January reports, there were 68 children whose names were not included in the reports for those two months. When the data error was repaired, the reports were generated the following month and the missing names were selected for follow

up to ensure that transition had, in fact occurred successfully. However, due to the fact that the names were submitted late, the state is not reporting 100% performance. Therefore, the state is reporting that 68 children's names were not received timely by the LDOE resulting in 96.59% performance for indicator 8B.

The reporting problem was discovered immediately and was an isolated event. The query which generates the report was subsequently upgraded to produce a broader age distribution for exiting children to allow more consistent tracking across months. More information on the calculation for reporting less than 100% performance follows in the next section.

Describe the method used to collect these data

For notification to the SEA and LEA, the data source was changed in 2006 from chart review of IFSPs to a central reporting process using EIDS. This process is described in Louisiana's February 2007 APR. In this process, a monthly data report of all active children at least age 2 years, 2 months through 3 years of age is sent to the LDOE. The appropriate LDOE contact acknowledges receipt of the list. Since this process started, the performance for this indicator has been reported as 100%, since 100% of the number of active children for the entire State for the given age range is sent to meet the timeline requirements. This year, there was a data system problem affecting the December, 2014 and January, 2015 reports resulting in late and/or missing data for those months. Usually, the monthly report includes duplicate names from a prior month due to the age ranges queried each month. However, for the December and January reports, there were 68 children whose names were not included in the reports for those two months. When the data error was repaired, the reports were generated later and the missing names were selected for follow up to ensure that transition had, in fact occurred successfully. However, due to the fact that the names were submitted late, the state is not reporting 100% performance.

The numbers of children sent in each month's report vary as the ages of the children change monthly. An average of 1,994 names per month was reported to the LDOE. Since the children falling within the age range will appear on the list several months in a row, the average number of children per month (1,994) is used for calculating results for this indicator, rather than the total sent, since the total would include duplicated data. Therefore, the state is reporting that 68 children's names were not received timely by the LDOE resulting in 96.5% performance for indicator 8B. Actual numbers as submitted and compared across several reporting periods appear below:

Transition List Totals per Month to LDOE

Month	Referrals 2014-15	Referrals 2013-14	Referrals 2012-13	Referrals 2011-12	Referrals 2010-11	Referrals 2009-10	Referrals 2008-09	Referrals 2008-09	Referrals 2006-07
July	1814	1935	2404	2603	2422	2241	1855	1353	1696
August	1944	1952	2191	2640	2283	2264	1924	1431	1471
September	1884	1922	2024	2624	2441	2280	1860	1415	1410
October	1906	1864	1953	2626	2443	2354	1922	1540	1368
November	1904	1888	1887	2585	2479	2363	1965	1580	1328
December	2179	1844	1850	2363	2582	2416	2018	1702	1398
January	2146	1808	1841	2561	2463	2423	1939	1721	1216
February	1726	1847	1908	2613	2553	2385	2010	1673	1304
March	2341	1840	1958	2633	2599	2411	2090	1790	1268
April	1939	1891	1955	2658	2597	2491	2162	1853	1362

May	2069	1831	1944	2624	2581	2461	2157	1874	1407
June	2081	1894	1931	2550	2632	2468	2210	1912	1430
Ave/Month	1,994 names per month	1,876 names per month	1987 names per month	2590 names per month	2506 names per month	2379 names per month	2009 names per month	1653 names per month	1388 per month

Upon receipt of the report, the LDOE sends an acknowledgement back to EarlySteps that the report was received, then disaggregates and sends the list to the appropriate LEA. The receiving LEA staff review the list and contact families to begin the eligibility determination process for Part B. Discrepancies are discussed with the FSC agency and/or Regional Coordinator. Examples of identified discrepancies include the reporting of a child of the appropriate age whose case was closed when the notification was sent or an incorrect address or contact phone number by which to reach the family. In addition, the LDOE staff compares the lists with its data system to monitor timely completion of IEPs by the third birthday. Discrepancies for timely IEPs are resolved with each LEA according to the LDOE protocol.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? No

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



State monitoring



State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Data for Indicator 8 b is from the full reporting period.

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

As described above, a report is generated monthly from EIDS for all active children ages 2 years, 2 months, through 3 years of age, an average of 1,994 names per month. With the exception of the data system error which occurred for the December and January reports, this data reflects the full reporting period. For the child data for the months of December and January, a report was run in subsequent months and children whose names should have appeared on the reports for those months were identified. These children were added to the transition data for follow up by the regional coordinators. All children successfully transitioned if Part B eligible. The late data for the two months occurred as an isolated event and was immediately corrected through follow up on the identified children as soon as the error was corrected. The state can verify that all identified children successfully transitioned.

☐ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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)

Actions required in FFY 2013 response	
Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings	

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition**Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance***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)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition**Historical Data and Targets***Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition***Compliance indicator:** The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

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

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

Historical Data*Baseline Data: 2005*

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		96.00%	85.00%	92.00%	91.40%	95.20%	98.20%	94.20%	93.00%	98.69%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

FFY 2014 Data

*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)

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
Indicator 8	1/18/2016	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	1,466	587

Explanation of Alternate Data

As discussed in the Indicator 8a section, census data for the reporting period was collected for all children exiting the program in the months of March, April, and May, 2014. The number of transitions monitored for this period represents 40% of the children who exited who were potentially eligible for Part B. This census data reflects all children for the full period selected for reporting.

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

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
540	587	98.69%	100%	96.42%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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 when calculating the FFY 2014 Data)	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 at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B)	26

Explanation of Slippage

Louisiana is reporting slight slippage of 2.3% from the 2013-14 reporting period. Family support coordinators have the responsibility for arranging transition conferences and developing transition plans according to IFSP requirements. Persons hired to perform these functions are typically less experienced,

not well paid and have frequent turnover resulting in almost constant re-training of staff responsible for implementing requirements. Two regions in particular had higher than usual turnover resulting new support coordinators not sufficiently trained or experienced in tracking timelines. There are local improvement activities underway to develop procedures to reduce turnover and improve performance both by the support coordinators and their supervisors.

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

- ☒ State monitoring
- ☐ State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

Louisiana uses both data from the State database and State monitoring to collect data for Indicator 8c. The process and time period used for reporting are discussed in the indicator 8a section.

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

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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)

Actions required in FFY 2013 response	
<div></div>	
Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings	
<div></div>	

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition**Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance***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)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected*Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

For 2013-14, 3 findings of non-compliance were issued to support coordination agencies for transition conferences which did not meet 8 c requirements. When the APR was submitted in February, 2015, these agencies were under corrective action. As of June 30, 2015, all findings were verified as corrected as follows:

- (1) each agency is correctly implementing the timely transition conference requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)) with 100% compliance based on chart review according to the corrective action plan; and
- (2) each agency has conducted a transition conference, although late, for any child potentially eligible for Part B whose transition conference was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program. Regional coordinators verified that each child successfully transitioned to the LEA, if Part B-eligible.

The status of the correction of findings is also provided in the Worksheet attached to the APR Indicator 1 section which details all findings and the status of correction.

For 2014-5, 11 findings of noncompliance were issued for this indicator. As of the February, 2016 APR submission, the agencies impacted are still under corrective action.

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

As described in section 8a, regional coordinators verified the status of transition to the LEA for each child if Part B-eligible.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None		

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions**Historical Data and Targets***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)

Historical Data*Baseline Data:*

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥										
Data										

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥					

Key:  Blue – Data Update**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

This indicator does not apply in Louisiana as EarlySteps does not use IDEA, Part B due process procedures.

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

FFY 2014 Data

*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)

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	<u>3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</u>	NA	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	<u>3.1 Number of resolution sessions</u>	NA	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
NA	NA			NA	N/A	N/A

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

☐ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions
Required Actions from FFY 2013

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)

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 10: Mediation**Historical Data and Targets***Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision***Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.**

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

Historical Data*Baseline Data: 2005*

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥										
Data										

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥					

Key:  Blue – Data Update**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Louisiana had no requests for mediation for 2014-15, therefore the state has not set targets for this indicator.

Indicator 10: Mediation**FFY 2014 Data**

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)

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	<u>2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</u>	0	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	<u>2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</u>	0	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	<u>2.1 Mediations held</u>	0	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0				N/A	N/A

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

☐ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 10: Mediation
Required Actions from FFY 2013

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)

Actions required in FFY 2013 response	
Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response	

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview




Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014
Target		42.50%
Data	42.50%	

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	45.00%	48.00%	50.00%	55.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Two documents will be attached to the SSIP, due to OSEP in April 2016. One outlines the stakeholders involved in the development of the SSIP and their roles and one that describes the planning and development process for Phase I and how decisions were made throughout the process. These documents and the attached SSIP will describe the stakeholder involvement for each of the SSIP components. Results of Phase II data analysis did not yield changes for current targets at this time.

Overview

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement
Plan
Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Data Analysis

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

The SSIP will be attached as a separate document which includes an update on Phase II data analysis activities.

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

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

The SSIP will be attached as a separate document and will include the State Infrastructure Phase II development activities to Support Improvement and Build Capacity component.

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

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

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child- or family-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increase the rate of growth in infants and toddlers demonstrating positive social-emotional skills) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increase the percentage reported under child outcome B under Indicator 3 of the SPP/APR (knowledge and skills) and increase the percentage trend reported for families under Indicator 4 (helping their child develop and learn)).

Statement

The EarlySteps state-identified measurable result (SIMR) is: The EarlySteps system will improve child outcomes through supports that are focused on family concerns, priorities, and resources and provided through a team-based approach. The SSIP submitted in April 2015 describes the selection process for Louisiana's SIMR.

Description

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

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

The state's April 2015 SSIP describes the process for selection of the coherent improvement strategies aligned to the SIMR. Phase II work resulted in the added improvment strategies as well as implementation steps to achieve them. Information about the process and the results will be submitted in April, 2016.

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Theory of Action

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

Theory of ActionTheory of Action

☒ Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

The process for developing Louisiana's Theory of Action is described in the April 2015 SSIP. No changes to the Theory of Action are proposed from the Phase II work and results which will be submitted in April 2016.

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Infrastructure Development

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

This section of the APR/SSIP will be submitted in April, 2016

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

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

Evaluation

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

Technical Assistance and Support

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

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

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

Selected: Designated by the Lead Agency Director to certify

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: Mark A. Thomas

Title: Assistant Secretary

Email: mark.thomas@la.gov

Phone: 225-342-0095