

MN Part C

FFY2014 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

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

Executive Summary:

--

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

General Supervision System:

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

The Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) administers a comprehensive system of general supervision including special education program and fiscal compliance monitoring, special education complaints, due process hearings and alternative dispute resolution options for parents, districts and other stakeholders in the special education and early intervention systems.

Program monitoring provides general supervision and oversight of special education and early intervention programs using the Minnesota Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (MNCIMP). MNCIMP is the vehicle for MDE's Division of Compliance and Assistance program monitoring unit to ensure a free appropriate public education (FAPE) is available for children with disabilities beginning at birth.

Each special education administrative unit (SEAU) is monitored for compliance through MDE's MNCIMP web-based data system which gathers data from early intervention records reviewed. Compliance monitoring takes place on a five-year cycle. In year one of the cycle, the SEAU conducts a self-review of records. A computer-generated sample is used to select the records to be reviewed from the most recent SEAU enrollment data chosen to accurately represent the SEAU as a whole. Selection is based on a stratified random sampling with consideration given to race/ethnicity, age, gender, and primary disability. During the record review process, the most current Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) and corresponding due process documentation are reviewed for compliance with legal standards. In year two, the SEAU must demonstrate correction of any noncompliance identified in the self-review consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02.

In year three of the cycle, MDE conducts an on-site review of the SEAU including a review of early intervention records (following the same process for record selection as used in year one). Stakeholder input is gathered from early intervention service providers, parents and administrators. Data gathered from the various stakeholders helps to determine compliance within the district as well as identify areas of needed technical assistance.

In year four of the cycle, the SEAU must demonstrate correction of noncompliance identified during the MDE review and implement any corrective action, again consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. The fifth year of the cycle is used to verify results of the implemented corrective action plan. In any given year, data is collected through the self-review of records for 20 percent of the local programs in Minnesota.

Fiscal monitors from MDE's Fiscal Monitoring Team work to ensure that Part C funds are only used to serve eligible children and are administered under appropriate internal controls in the SEAU. Fiscal monitoring and program monitoring teams follow the same five year schedule with the exception that there is no self review process in fiscal monitoring. Annually, a risk assessment is completed in order to determine if an SEAU will receive an onsite review or one of two types of desk reviews. Once the SEAU's have been stratified into their appropriate risk category, the fiscal monitors utilize the Electronic Data Reporting System (EDRS) and the Minnesota Automated Reporting Student System (MARSS) to pick samples related to time and effort, procurement, and transportation. Additionally, information is

requested from the SEAU for inventory management. Each of the three levels of review request additional samples, more documentation, and monitor additional details of the data as the SEAU progresses higher in risk.

Corrective action by the local program as needed takes place in the year following a fiscal monitoring. Corrective action may include documenting processes, changing documents so they contain appropriate data, or making corrections within the EDRS or MARSS systems so data entered is accurate. MDE also reserves the right to reclaim funds should it be deemed funds were used for ineligible purposes.

Finally, the fiscal monitoring team receives fiscally based complaints and conducts investigations as necessary. When complaints come in to the agency, the investigation is led by the supervisor of this group but is also assigned to a monitor to assist. A complaint can be filed about any entity that provides publicly funded intervention services directly to families and children with disabilities that has violated a state or federal special education law or rule. Before filing a complaint, MDE encourages parents or other persons to first contact the school district's special education director, who may be able to help resolve the issue.

Once a fiscal investigation is opened, the entity is notified and provided a short timeline to provide requested documentation based on the nature of the complaint. Interviews with staff may be conducted, if necessary, and an on-site visit may occur. If the LEA is found to be in violation and a corrective action is deemed necessary, a corrective action plan is developed and the responsible education agencies must complete the corrective action within the specified timeframe. Through active follow-up, MDE ensures that corrective action plans are appropriately implemented and individual correction occurs within one year.

As noted, MDE administers a comprehensive dispute resolution system for the state. Minnesota Special Education Mediation Service (MNSEMS) provides conflict resolution assistance for students, schools, parents and agencies. Parents and program staff can use mediation or facilitated IFSP meeting(s) to address issues of conflict. During the summer of 2014, MDE's Special Education ADR Services conducted a continuous improvement process involving internal and external stakeholders, examined its procedures, and made changes to improve ADR's efficiency and effectiveness. Some changes included submission of requests online, faster online scheduling, automated emails, and the development of a vision of success for parents, older students, and educators.

Parents and districts are entitled to an impartial due process hearing to resolve disputes over identification, evaluation, education placement, or provision of a free appropriate public education to an infant, toddler or student with a disability. Parents and districts are encouraged to use mediation, conciliation or some other mutually agreed upon alternative before proceeding to a hearing. Information about the hearing system is available on the MDE website including a Hearing Request form, information on free or low-cost legal resources and Minnesota's procedural safeguards notice. While the majority of due process hearing requests are settled or resolved without a hearing, MDE continues to work with the Office of Administrative hearings, who conducts the hearings, districts, and parent advocates to educate parents and districts on their rights and responsibilities regarding due process hearing resolution sessions. Through these efforts, district participation in documenting the occurrence of the resolution sessions has increased by 100%. In addition, MDE is obtaining more accurate data regarding when the sessions are held and the results of the resolution session.

The special education complaint system is designed to ensure that all children with disabilities, including infants and toddlers, are provided a free appropriate public education. A complaint can be filed about any entity that provides publicly funded intervention services directly to families and children with disabilities that has violated a state or federal special education law or rule. Before filing a complaint, MDE encourages parents or other persons to first contact the school district's special education director, who may be able to help resolve the issue. Sample complaint forms for use by parents, other entities or private school stakeholders are available on the MDE website.

When MDE receives a complaint, an investigator is assigned who reviews the written complaint to determine the issues to be investigated. The individual or entity that filed the complaint is contacted and the issues, claims and facts are discussed. MDE has 60 calendar days to fully investigate and resolve the complaint from the date the complaint is received in writing. If the LEA is found to be in violation and a corrective action is deemed necessary, a corrective action plan is developed and the responsible education agencies must complete the corrective action within the specified timeframe. Through active follow-up, MDE ensures that corrective action plans are appropriately implemented and individual correction occurs within one year.

Compliance and Assistance staff collaborates with other departmental divisions regarding the provision of early intervention and special education services.

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.

The Early Childhood Special Education Team at the Minnesota Department of Education believes their role is to support local programs to "do it right and do it well" so that infants, toddlers and young children with disabilities and their families experience positive outcomes. "Doing it right" refers to those aspects of the work where there is a generally agreed upon right way and wrong way. "Doing it well" refers to efforts to achieve high levels of quality including the use of evidence-based practices. Our technical assistance (TA) efforts are our efforts to help programs do it right.

MDE uses a variety of mechanisms to provide technical assistance to leaders and providers within early childhood special education programs, which are responsible to deliver early intervention services. Our website is a constant source of information for families, administrators and direct service providers. MDE hosts two face-to-face opportunities annually to provide technical assistance to local program leaders. Each fall, a three day leadership conference is held in partnership with the Minnesota Division for Early Childhood of the Council for Exceptional Children. A one-day leadership forum is held each spring. Leaders from greater Minnesota have the option to participate in the forum virtually. A monthly call is held for program leaders focused almost exclusively on technical assistance. The call takes place the first Wednesday of each month at 1 PM which coincides with our states civil defense drills. Our local leaders know "if the siren is blowing they should be on the call". Members of the ECSE team provide individualized TA over the phone or on-site as needed or requested by a local program. MDE has established a team email box mde.ecse@state.mn.us to make it easier for local programs to consistently receive a timely, high quality answer to their technical questions. Kara Tempel, our Part C Coordinator, triages all messages to this mailbox, forwarding each message to the team member with the deepest knowledge in the needed subject.

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.

Strengthening our professional development system has been a team priority for the past seven years. During that time we have benefited considerably from participation in several important federal initiatives.

1. National Professional Development Center on Inclusion (NPDCI): Minnesota was one of four states selected to work with experts from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. This opportunity helped us establish a cross-sector state leadership team, create regional cross-sector professional development councils and launch regionalized professional development focused on selected evidence-based practices.
2. Technical Assistance Center on Social Emotional Intervention (TACSEI): Minnesota was one of four states selected to be supported to implement the practices of the pyramid model. We started with three demonstration sites and are now implementing in 53 local programs.
3. State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP): Minnesota was one of six states selected to participate in the initial cohort. Karen Blase has provided the ECSE team with considerable guidance and support in refining and refocusing our professional development system.

The frameworks of active implementation are foundational to our enhanced professional development system.

4. Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center: Minnesota was the first state selected to receive targeted technical assistance to implement the revised Recommended Practices developed by the Division of Early Childhood of the Council for Exceptional Children. Commonly referred to as DEC's Recommended Practices, this work is focused on those practices that support child and family engagement in intervention.

Our professional development system is now referred to as the Centers of Excellence for Young Children with Disabilities (CoE). The stated vision of the CoE is that early childhood professionals will have the knowledge, skills and supports necessary to be effective in their respective roles in order to increase the probability that young children with disabilities and their families achieve positive outcomes. The CoE includes these structural components:

- Professional Development Facilitators located within each region of the state. The 10.0 FTE of individuals in this role actively partner with local program leaders to identify opportunities to improve quality and serve as the external coach to those programs implementing one of the three evidence-based usable interventions formally promoted through the CoE.
- State Leadership Team of cross-sector state agency personnel, higher education faculty, parents, and other stakeholders in the system.
- Consistent use of the frameworks of active implementation.
- Three usable interventions that are evidence-informed. These include the Pyramid Model (TACSEI), Family-guided Routines-based Intervention (FGRBI), and the Classroom Engagement Model.

During FFY14 we targeted discretionary federal funds to support local programs committing to the implementation of one of three usable interventions. The funds are available to selected programs over a five-year period to eliminate identified barriers to scaling and sustaining use of these practices.

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.

A workgroup was convened to review data and develop preliminary targets. That workgroup was comprised of volunteer members of Minnesota's Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) and state agency staff from the Minnesota Departments of Health and Education. That group reviewed historical performance and target data for each indicator and discussed past contextual factors that helped or hindered the state's effort to meet or exceed each target. The group also identified factors that might similarly help or hinder the state's efforts to make progress from baseline for each indicator. From those discussions, preliminary targets were set for each indicator for each year included within the State Performance Plan (SPP). Preliminary targets were shared with local program leaders during a monthly Leadership Call and with the ICC during the quarterly meeting of the ICC. Each target was finalized through a vote of the ICC during its quarterly meeting on January 8, 2015.

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.

MDE makes an annual determination on the performance of each Special Education Administrative Unit (SEAU) against specific criteria. MDE reviews all SEAU performance against selected targets in the Annual Performance Report (APR) and determines whether each SEAU met the requirements of Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

MDE publicly reports the performance of each SEAU by member district in its Data Center website under the Special Education District Profiles section. Performance on Part C indicators 1-8 are displayed on a data sheet that includes the program performance, the state rate and the state target. These district data profiles can be found at the link immediately below.

<http://w20.education.state.mn.us/MDEAnalytics/Data.jsp>

A complete copy of Minnesota's SPP and current APR are located on MDE's website on the landing page for the Governor's Interagency Coordinating Council.

<http://education.state.mn.us/MDE/Welcome/AdvBCT/ICC/index.html>

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 1: Timely provision of services

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		91.00%	98.80%	98.00%	99.40%	98.80%	98.00%	99.75%	100%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
258	258	100%	100%	100%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner)

null

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.

Data for this indicator has been collected through MDE's Minnesota Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (MNCIMP) web-based data system. The MNCIMP web-based data system is used in part for gathering data from record reviews completed as part of compliance monitoring. Compliance monitoring of Early Intervention (EI) programs occurs through the monitoring of the Local Education Agencies (LEAs) through special education administrative units (SEAs) which have been scheduled on a five-year cycle. In year one of the cycle, the LEA conducts a self-review of records. In year two, the LEA must demonstrate correction of any noncompliance identified in the self-review consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. In year three, MDE conducts an on-site review of the LEA including a review of EI records, facilities, and the LEAs Total Special Education System (TSES). In year four of the cycle, the LEA must demonstrate correction of noncompliance identified during the MDE review and implement any corrective action, again consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. The fifth year of the cycle is used to verify results of the implemented corrective action plan. In FFY 2015, MDE moved to a six year monitoring cycle. The sixth year of the cycle will be an additional year for LEAs to implement corrective action and changes to their systems prior to the start of the new monitoring cycle and self-review of records.

As part of the record review, a computer-generated sample is used to determine the EI records to be reviewed. Records are selected from the most recent SEAU enrollment data and are chosen in order to be accurately representative of the SEAU as a whole. Selection is based on a stratified random sampling with consideration given to race/ethnicity, age, and gender. During the record review, the most current Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) and corresponding due process documentation are monitored to determine that legal

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

standards are met.

Data for this indicator are gathered from examining records of children receiving Part C services and determining whether the services were provided in a timely manner. The FFY 2014 data are based on MDE reviews and LEA self-review of 56 SEAU, comprised of 131 individual districts. Timely initiation of services means that EI services are initiated within 30 calendar days of meeting to develop the IFSP.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

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

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			90.00%	91.00%	92.00%	92.50%	96.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Data		90.30%	92.30%	93.80%	94.50%	95.50%	95.35%	95.90%	96.00%	96.61%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

A workgroup was convened to review data and develop preliminary targets. That workgroup was comprised of volunteer members of Minnesota's Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) and state agency staff from the Minnesota Departments of Health and Education. That group reviewed historical performance and target data for each indicator and discussed past contextual factors that helped or hindered the state's effort to meet or exceed each target. The group also identified factors that might similarly help or hinder the state's efforts to make progress from baseline for each indicator. From those discussions, preliminary targets were set for each indicator for each year included within the State Performance Plan (SPP). Preliminary targets were shared with local program leaders during a monthly Leadership Call and with the ICC during the quarterly meeting of the ICC. Each target was finalized through a vote of the ICC.

Discussion specific to this indicator focused on the desire to maintain a robust target at 95% throughout the years covered by the SPP while acknowledging the need for flexibility among members of Individual Family Service Plan teams to identify times when it is justifiable to provide early intervention services in an environment that is not a natural environment.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	5,300	

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

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	5,449	

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
5,300	5,449	96.61%	95.00%	97.27%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A1	2013	Target ≥						66.00%	64.00%	65.00%	66.00%	54.13%
		Data					64.10%	63.80%	63.00%	58.80%	57.70%	54.13%
A2	2013	Target ≥						41.00%	42.00%	42.50%	43.00%	49.82%
		Data					40.40%	42.20%	44.00%	48.30%	49.50%	49.82%
B1	2013	Target ≥						70.00%	66.00%	67.00%	68.00%	60.20%
		Data					68.20%	65.10%	65.00%	62.50%	61.20%	60.20%
B2	2013	Target ≥						42.00%	43.00%	43.50%	44.00%	44.11%
		Data					40.70%	42.20%	41.00%	43.40%	45.10%	44.11%
C1	2013	Target ≥						70.00%	68.00%	69.00%	70.00%	61.91%
		Data					68.00%	67.30%	66.00%	64.00%	62.70%	61.91%
C2	2013	Target ≥						44.00%	45.00%	45.50%	46.00%	51.26%
		Data					42.70%	44.20%	46.00%	49.20%	49.70%	51.26%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	54.20%	54.30%	54.40%	54.50%	54.60%
Target A2 ≥	50.00%	51.00%	52.00%	53.00%	54.00%
Target B1 ≥	60.30%	60.40%	60.50%	60.60%	60.70%
Target B2 ≥	44.50%	45.00%	45.50%	46.50%	47.50%
Target C1 ≥	62.00%	62.10%	62.20%	62.30%	62.40%
Target C2 ≥	51.50%	52.00%	53.00%	54.00%	55.00%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

The A2 target for 2018 did not prepopulate so was added.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

A workgroup was convened to review data and develop preliminary targets. That workgroup was comprised

of volunteer members of Minnesota's Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) and state agency staff from the Minnesota Departments of Health and Education. That group reviewed historical performance and target data for each indicator and discussed past contextual factors that helped or hindered the state's effort to meet or exceed each target. The group also identified factors that might similarly help or hinder the state's efforts to make progress from baseline for each indicator. From those discussions, preliminary targets were set for each indicator for each year included within the State Performance Plan (SPP). Preliminary targets were shared with local program leaders during a monthly Leadership Call and with the ICC during the quarterly meeting of the ICC. Each target was finalized through a vote of the ICC.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	3153.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	24.00	0.76%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1101.00	34.92%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	530.00	16.81%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	649.00	20.58%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	849.00	26.93%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	1179.00	2304.00	54.13%	54.20%	51.17%
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 $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	1498.00	3153.00	49.82%	50.00%	47.51%

Explanation of A1 Slippage

In an attempt to understand why too few infants and toddlers made greater than expected progress in positive social relationships we examined our outcome data from multiple perspectives and identified these key aspects of our performance:

1. Infants and toddlers who were experiencing poverty at the time of exit were less likely to have made greater than expected progress (47.5%) compared to children who were not reported to be experiencing poverty (53.0%).
2. Early intervention programs may use the state's definition of developmental delay or any more specific disability category to establish eligibility for services under Part C. The subgroups of children eligible under speech/language or visually impaired met our target. These subgroups represent only ten percent of all infants and toddlers who exited early intervention in FFY14 after receiving six or more months of service.
3. Children from English-speaking families were more likely to have substantially increased their rate of growth than children from families with other home primary languages (51.8% compared to 46.0%).
4. Children whose entrance ratings were most discrepant from age-expected skills - ratings of 1-3 - were most likely to substantially increase their rate of growth in positive social relationships.
5. The denominator for this outcome includes 334 infants or toddlers who entered early intervention demonstrating age expected social skills. Most of these were infants identified younger than six months of age.
6. Through our in-depth infrastructure analysis we identified a statewide workforce shortage. As the number of children served under Part C has increased the workforce available to meet the needs of their children and their families has not increased commensurately. Consequently, children exited during FFY14 having received an average of 3.5 fewer hours of early intervention service than children who exited during FFY 13 and 10 fewer hours than the children who exited in FFY12.
7. Districts reported taking significant action to continuously improve the quality of their assessment practices and child outcome data. Five local programs reported a transition to an assessment tool that calculates the child outcome summary rating on behalf of the IFSP team. We have heard anecdotally from these programs that the

ratings, on average, are lower than those ratings generated without the use of this tool. Twenty-three programs reported having had a professional development focus on assessment and child outcomes during FFY14. Ten programs report taking steps to improve their local process of reaching consensus between service delivery teams on the Part C exit rating which, in Minnesota, is also their Part B entrance rating.

Explanation of A2 Slippage

In an attempt to understand why too few children exited Part C demonstrating age-expected social skills, we examined our outcome data from multiple perspectives and identified these key aspects of our performance:

1. Infants and toddlers who were experiencing poverty at the time of exit from Part C were significantly less likely to have exited demonstrating age expected skills (40.0%) compared to children who were not reported to be experiencing poverty (50.8%).
2. Four subgroups of eligible infants and toddlers met our target. These subgroups included speech/language, physically impaired, deaf or hard of hearing, and visually impaired. These children represent less than one fifth of children who exited during FFY14 after receiving six or more months of service.
3. Infants and toddlers from English-speaking families were only slightly more likely to exit demonstrating age-expected skills than children from families speaking other home primary languages (48.1% compared to 42.3%).
4. Infants and toddlers who received twelve to 24 months of intervention were more likely to exit demonstrating age-expected social relationships compared to children who received more or fewer months of intervention. Children identified earliest were least likely to exit meeting age expectations.
5. Through our in-depth infrastructure analysis we identified a statewide workforce shortage. As the number of children served under Part C has increased the workforce available to meet the needs of their children and their families has not increased commensurately. Consequently, children exited during FFY14 having received an average of 3.5 fewer hours of early intervention service than children who exited during FFY 13 and 10 fewer hours than the children who exited in FFY12.
6. Districts reported taking significant action to continuously improve the quality of their assessment practices and child outcome data. Five local programs reported a transition to an assessment tool that calculates the child outcome summary rating on behalf of the IFSP team. We have heard anecdotally from these programs that the ratings, on average, are lower than those ratings generated without the use of this tool. Twenty-three programs reported having had a professional development focus on assessment and child outcomes during FFY14. Ten programs report taking steps to improve their local process of reaching consensus between service delivery teams on the Part C exit rating which, in Minnesota, is also their Part B entrance rating.

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	25.00	0.79%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1097.00	34.79%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	717.00	22.74%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	780.00	24.74%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	534.00	16.94%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	1497.00	2619.00	60.20%	60.30%	57.16%
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 $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	1314.00	3153.00	44.11%	44.50%	41.67%

Explanation of B1 Slippage

In an attempt to understand why too few infants and toddlers made greater than expected progress in their acquisition and use of knowledge and skills we examined our outcome data from multiple perspectives and identified these key aspects of our performance:

1. Infants and toddlers who were experiencing poverty at the time of exit were only slightly less likely to have made greater than expected progress (58.3%) compared to those who were not reported to be experiencing poverty (59.0%).
2. Early intervention programs may use the state's definition of developmental delay or any more specific disability category to establish eligibility for services under Part C. Only the subgroup of children eligible under speech/language met our established performance target. This subgroup represents only ten percent of all infants and toddlers who exited early intervention in FFY14 after receiving six or more months of service.
3. Infants and toddlers from English-speaking families were slightly less likely to have substantially increased their rate of growth than children from families with other home primary languages (57.1% compared to 57.5%).
4. Infants and toddlers whose entrance ratings were most discrepant from age-expected skills, ratings of 1-3, were most likely to substantially increase their rate of growth in their ability to acquire and use knowledge and skills.
5. The denominator for this outcome includes 234 infants or toddlers who entered early intervention demonstrating age-expected skills related to this outcome. Most of these were infants identified younger than six months of age.
6. Through our in-depth infrastructure analysis we identified a statewide workforce shortage. As the number of children served under Part C has increased the workforce

available to meet the needs of their children and their families has not increased commensurately. Consequently, children exited during FFY14 having received an average of 3.5 fewer hours of early intervention service than children who exited during FFY 13 and 10 fewer hours than the children who exited in FFY12.

7. Districts reported taking significant action to continuously improve the quality of their assessment practices and child outcome data. Five local programs reported a transition to an assessment tool that calculates the child outcome summary rating on behalf of the IFSP team. We have heard anecdotally from these programs that the ratings, on average, are lower than those ratings generated without the use of this tool. Twenty-three programs reported having had a professional development focus on assessment and child outcomes during FFY14. Ten programs report taking steps to improve their local process of reaching consensus between service delivery teams on the Part C exit rating which, in Minnesota, is also their Part B entrance rating.

Explanation of B2 Slippage

In an attempt to understand why too few infants and toddlers exited Part C demonstrating age-expected ability in their acquisition and use of knowledge and skill, we examined our outcome data from multiple perspectives and identified these key aspects of our performance:

1. Infants and toddlers who were experiencing poverty at the time of exit from Part C were significantly less likely to have exited demonstrating age expected skills (36.6%) compared to children who were not reported to be experiencing poverty (45.1%).
2. Four subgroups of eligible infants and toddlers met our target. These subgroups included developmental delay, physically impaired, deaf or hard of hearing, and visually impaired. These children represent 82 percent of children who exited during FFY14 after receiving six or more months of service.
3. Infants and toddlers from English-speaking families were more likely to exit demonstrating age-expected skills than children from families speaking other home primary languages (42.6% compared to 34.3%).
4. Through our in-depth infrastructure analysis we identified a statewide workforce shortage. As the number of infants and toddlers served under Part C has increased, the workforce available to meet the needs of their children and families has not increased commensurately. Consequently, infants and toddlers exited during FFY14 having received an average of 3.5 fewer hours of early intervention service than children who exited during FFY 13 and 10 fewer hours than the children who exited in FFY12.
5. Districts reported taking significant action to continuously improve the quality of their assessment practices and child outcome data. Five local programs reported a transition to an assessment tool that calculates the child outcome summary rating on behalf of the IFSP team. We have heard anecdotally from these programs that the ratings, on average, are lower than those ratings generated without the use of this tool. Twenty-three programs reported having had a professional development focus on assessment and child outcomes during FFY14. Ten report taking steps to improve their local process of reaching consensus between service delivery teams on the Part C exit rating which, in Minnesota, is also their Part B entrance rating.

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	26.00	0.82%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	965.00	30.61%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	591.00	18.74%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	871.00	27.62%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	700.00	22.20%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	1462.00	2453.00	61.91%	62.00%	59.60%
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 $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	1571.00	3153.00	51.26%	51.50%	49.83%

Explanation of C1 Slippage

In an attempt to understand why too few infants and toddlers made greater than expected progress in their ability to take appropriate action to meet their needs, we examined our outcome data from multiple perspectives and identified these key aspects of our performance:

1. Infants and toddlers who were experiencing poverty at the time of exit were slightly less likely to have made greater than expected progress in their ability to take action to meet needs (57.0%) compared to children who were not reported to be experiencing poverty (60.9%).
2. Only one subgroup of infants and toddlers, those eligible under speech/language impaired, met our target. These infants and toddlers represent 10 percent of those who exited during FFY14 after receiving six or more months of service.
3. The denominator for this outcome includes 193 infants and toddlers who entered early intervention services demonstrating age expected skills.
4. Infants and toddlers from English-speaking families were more likely to have substantially increased their rate of growth when compared to infants and toddlers from families speaking other home primary languages (59.9% to 54.0%).
5. Through our in-depth infrastructure analysis we identified a statewide workforce shortage. As the number of infants and toddlers served under Part C has increased, the

workforce available to meet the needs of their children and families has not grown commensurately. Consequently, infants and toddlers exited during FFY14 having received an average of 3.5 fewer hours of early intervention service than children who exited during FFY 13 and 10 fewer hours than the children who exited in FFY12.

6. Districts reported taking significant action to continuously improve the quality of their assessment practices and child outcome data. Five local programs reported a transition to an assessment tool that calculates the child outcome summary rating on behalf of the IFSP team. We have heard anecdotally from these programs that the ratings, on average, are lower than those ratings generated without the use of this tool. Twenty-three programs reported having had a professional development focus on assessment and child outcomes during FFY14. Ten programs report taking steps to improve their local process of reaching consensus between service delivery teams on the Part C exit rating which, in Minnesota, is also their Part B entrance rating.

Explanation of C2 Slippage

In an attempt to understand why too few infants and toddlers exited Part C demonstrating age-expected skills in their ability to take action to meet their needs, we examined our outcome data from multiple perspectives and identified these key aspects of our performance:

1. Children who were experiencing poverty at the time of exit were significantly less likely to have exited demonstrating age expected skills (43.3%) compared to children who were not reported to be experiencing poverty (52.1%).
2. Two subgroups of infants and toddlers met our target. These subgroups included those eligible through speech/language and deaf or hard of hearing criteria. These children represent only 12.5 percent of children who exited during FFY14 after receiving six or more months of service.
3. Infants and toddlers from English-speaking families were slightly more likely to exit demonstrating age-expected skills than those from families speaking other home primary languages (50.0% compared to 48.2%).
4. Through our in-depth infrastructure analysis we identified a statewide workforce shortage. As the number of infants and toddlers served under Part C has increased, the workforce available to meet the needs of their children and families has not grown commensurately. Consequently, infants and toddlers exited during FFY14 having received an average of 3.5 fewer hours of early intervention service than children who exited during FFY 13 and 10 fewer hours than the children who exited in FFY12.
5. There is an understandable inverse relationship between dosage and duration and the likelihood that an infant or toddler will exit demonstrating age-expected skills in taking action to meet needs. Those identified earliest and those who received the most intense services were least likely to exit meeting age expectations.
6. Districts reported taking significant action to continuously improve the quality of their assessment practices and child outcome data. Five local programs reported a transition to an assessment tool that calculates the child outcome summary rating on behalf of the IFSP team. We have heard anecdotally from these programs that the ratings, on average, are lower than those ratings generated without the use of this tool. Twenty-three programs reported having had a professional development focus on assessment and child outcomes during FFY14. Ten programs report taking steps to improve their local process of reaching consensus between service delivery teams on the Part C exit rating which, in Minnesota, is also their Part B entrance rating.

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? Yes



Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Minnesota holds itself to a high standard related to our system of measuring and reporting child outcome data. We are one of very few states that consistently and systematically uses our Part C exit data as our Part B entrance data. This requires members of a local programs Part C team to work to reach consensus on the Part C Exit/Part B entrance rating for those children who are served by a different local team or in a different program setting as the child turns three. Our system holds itself accountable for the accurating of that rating. In many states there may be little or no correlation between the state's Part C exit rating and the Part B entrance rating, assigned by different serving agency, as the child turns 3. We believe this to be an important consideration when comparing Minnesota's child outcome data to that of other states.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2013	Target ≥					85.00%	90.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	89.00%
		Data			75.00%	76.60%	81.00%	82.00%	84.00%	82.70%	86.10%	89.22%
B	2013	Target ≥					86.00%	88.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	93.00%
		Data			87.00%	83.10%	87.00%	89.00%	90.00%	88.20%	89.70%	92.58%
C	2013	Target ≥					93.00%	96.00%	100%	92.00%	92.00%	90.00%
		Data			90.00%	86.70%	90.00%	92.00%	87.00%	86.40%	86.60%	89.80%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	90.00%	90.30%	90.60%	91.00%	91.50%
Target B ≥	93.20%	93.40%	93.60%	93.80%	94.00%
Target C ≥	90.30%	90.60%	90.90%	91.20%	91.50%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

A workgroup was convened to review data and develop preliminary targets. That workgroup was comprised of volunteer members of Minnesota's Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) and state agency staff from the Minnesota Departments of Health and Education. That group reviewed historical performance and target data for each indicator and discussed past contextual factors that helped or hindered the state's effort to meet or exceed each target. The group also identified factors that might similarly help or hinder the state's efforts to make progress from baseline for each indicator. From those discussions, preliminary targets were set for each indicator for each year included within the State Performance Plan (SPP). Preliminary targets were shared with local program leaders during a monthly Leadership Call and with the ICC during the quarterly meeting of the ICC. Each target was finalized through a vote of the ICC.

Discussion specific to this indicator focused on recent efforts to help parents better understand their rights and shared belief in the importance of helping parents to help their children develop and learn.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent families participating in Part C	3153.00
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	909.00
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	1040.00
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	946.00
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	1040.00
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	914.00
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	1040.00

	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	89.22%	90.00%	87.40%
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	92.58%	93.20%	90.96%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	89.80%	90.30%	87.88%

Explanation of A Slippage

In an attempt to understand why too few families report that early intervention helped them know their rights, we examined our family outcome data from multiple perspectives and identified these key aspects of our performance:

1. Families who were experiencing poverty at the time of exit were slightly more likely to report that early intervention helped them know their rights (87.7%) compared to families who did not report experiencing poverty (87.3%).
2. Early intervention programs may use the state's definition of developmental delay or any more specific disability category to establish eligibility for services under Part C. Families of the subgroup deaf and hard of hearing were most likely to report that early intervention helped them know their rights. No subgroup met our established target.
3. English-speaking families were much more likely to report that early intervention helped them know their rights compared with families who speak other home primary languages (88.0% compared to 81.2%).
4. Only multi-racial families reported that early intervention helped them know their rights at a rate that met our established target.
5. There is a predictive relationship between a child's developmental status at entrance or exit and the likelihood that a family will report that early intervention helped them know their rights. Families of children whose entrance ratings in acquisition and use of knowledge and skill were most discrepant from age-expected skills, ratings of 1-3, were least likely to report that early intervention helped them know their rights. Similarly, families of children whose exit ratings were age expected or nearly age-expected, ratings of 5-7, were most likely to report that early intervention helped them know their rights.
6. Through our in-depth infrastructure analysis we identified a statewide workforce shortage. As the number of children served under Part C has increased the workforce available to meet the needs of their children and families has not increased commensurately. Consequently, families exited Part C during FFY14 having received an average of 3.5 fewer hours of early intervention service than families who exited during FFY 13 and 10 fewer hours than the families who exited in FFY12.
7. During FFY14 many local programs implemented special efforts to increase response rates. The number of family outcome surveys returned by families increased from 864 in FFY13 to 1040 this year. This broadening of responses may have played a role in our measured performance.

Explanation of B Slippage

In an attempt to understand why too few families report that early intervention helped them to communicate their child's needs, we examined our family outcome data from multiple perspectives and identified these key aspects of our performance:

1. Families who were experiencing poverty at the time of exit were slightly more likely to report that early intervention helped them communicate their child's needs (91.7%) compared to families who did not report experiencing poverty (90.7%).
2. Early intervention programs may use the state's definition of developmental delay or any more specific disability category to establish eligibility for services under Part C. Families of children eligible under speech/language impairment were most likely to report that early intervention helped them communicate their child's needs. This was the only subgroup that met our established target.
3. English-speaking families were much more likely to report that early intervention helped them communicate their child's needs compared with families who speak other home primary languages (91.3% compared to 87.0%).
4. Only American Indian and multi-racial families reported that early intervention helped them communicate the needs of their children at a rate that met our established target.
5. There is a relationship between a child's developmental status at exit and the likelihood that a family will report that early intervention helped them to communicate the needs of their child. Only 70% of families whose children demonstrated development most discrepant from age expectations in acquisition and use of knowledge and skill reported that early intervention helped them communicate their child's needs. Conversely, 95% of the families of children exiting meeting age-expectations in acquisition and use of knowledge and skills reported that early intervention has helped them communicate the needs of their children.
6. Through our in-depth infrastructure analysis we identified a statewide workforce shortage. As the number of children served under Part C has increased the workforce available to meet the needs of their children and their families has not increased commensurately. Consequently, families exited Part C during FFY14 having received an average of 3.5 fewer hours of early intervention service than families who exited during FFY 13 and 10 fewer hours than the families who exited in FFY12.
7. During FFY14 many local programs implemented special efforts to increase response rates. The number of family outcome surveys returned by families increased from

864 in FFY13 to 1040 this year. This broadening of responses may have played a role in our measured performance.

Explanation of C Slippage

In an attempt to understand why too few families report that early intervention helped them to help their child develop and learn, we examined our family outcome data from multiple perspectives and identified these key aspects of our performance:

1. Families who were experiencing poverty at the time of exit were slightly more likely to report that early intervention helped them to help their child develop and learn (88.7%) compared to families who did not report experiencing poverty (87.5%).
2. Early intervention programs may use the state's definition of developmental delay or any more specific disability category to establish eligibility for services under Part C. Families of the subgroup deaf and hard of hearing were most likely to report that early intervention helped them to help their child develop and learn. Deaf-hard of hearing was the only subgroup that met our established target.
3. English-speaking families were slightly less likely to report that early intervention helped them help their child develop and learn compared with families who speak other home primary languages (87.9%% compared to 88.2%).
4. Only Hispanic and multi-racial families reported that early intervention helped them to help their child develop and learn at a rate that met our established target.
5. There is an understandable relationship between a child's developmental status at exit and the likelihood that a family will report that early intervention helped them to help their child develop and learn. Only 66.7 percent of families of children whose exit ratings were most discrepant from age-expected skills reported that early intervention helped them to help their child develop and learn compared to 91.6% of families with children exiting early intervention demonstrating age expected ability to acquire and use knowledge and skill.
6. Through our in-depth infrastructure analysis we identified a statewide workforce shortage. As the number of children served under Part C has increased the workforce available to meet the needs of their children and their families has not increased commensurately. Consequently, families exited Part C during FFY14 having received an average of 3.5 fewer hours of early intervention service than families who exited during FFY 13 and 10 fewer hours than the families who exited in FFY12.
7. During FFY14 many local programs implemented special efforts to increase response rates. The number of family outcome surveys returned by families increased from 864 in FFY13 to 1040 this year. This broadening of responses may have played a role in our measured performance.

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

Minnesota does not use sampling in collecting data or reporting this indicator. The pool of potential respondents exactly matches the demographics of families served by and exiting Part C. All families who have participated in early intervention services for six months or more are provided the Family Outcome Survey at the time of transition to Part B or to other community supports and services. The Family Outcome Survey has been translated into thirteen languages to limit barriers attributable to a family's home primary language being a language other than English. The Minnesota Department of Education has provided local programs with procedures to use to obtain survey data from families who do not read or whose primary language is not a written language.

During FFY14 many local programs implemented special efforts to increase response rates. The number of family outcome surveys returned by families increased from 864 in FFY13 to 1040 this year. This broadening of responses may have played a role in our measured performance.

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No



Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State



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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			0.55%	0.60%	0.80%	0.85%	0.85%	0.88%	0.90%	0.98%
Data		0.46%	0.63%	0.62%	0.79%	0.74%	0.91%	0.87%	0.98%	0.97%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	1.00%	1.05%	1.10%	1.15%	1.20%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

A workgroup was convened to review data and develop preliminary targets. That workgroup was comprised of volunteer members of Minnesota's Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) and state agency staff from the Minnesota Departments of Health and Education. That group reviewed historical performance and target data for each indicator and discussed past contextual factors that helped or hindered the state's effort to meet or exceed each target. The group also identified factors that might similarly help or hinder the state's efforts to make progress from baseline for each indicator. From those discussions, preliminary targets were set for each indicator for each year included within the State Performance Plan (SPP). Preliminary targets were shared with local program leaders during a monthly Leadership Call and with the ICC during the quarterly meeting of the ICC. Each target was finalized through a vote of the ICC.

Discussion specific to this indicator focused on the continued impact of Minnesota's heightened efforts to inform all primary referral sources through the Help Me Grow public awareness campaign, changes made to a state data system which mandates referrals from child protective services and enhanced convenience for primary referral sources of the automated referral conduit, implemented during June of 2014. We also discussed the limitations on eligibility imposed by our criteria. Specifically, at what point will we have reached our maximum eligibility rate?

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment	7/2/2015	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	733	null

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

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
Data Groups				
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013	4/3/2014	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	69,399	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
733	69,399	0.97%	1.00%	1.06%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			1.70%	1.90%	2.10%	2.25%	2.30%	2.35%	2.40%	2.50%
Data		1.56%	1.70%	1.83%	2.10%	2.15%	2.37%	2.45%	2.44%	2.49%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	2.53%	2.60%	2.68%	2.75%	2.82%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

A workgroup was convened to review data and develop preliminary targets. That workgroup was comprised of volunteer members of Minnesota's Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) and state agency staff from the Minnesota Departments of Health and Education. That group reviewed historical performance and target data for each indicator and discussed past contextual factors that helped or hindered the state's effort to meet or exceed each target. The group also identified factors that might similarly help or hinder the state's efforts to make progress from baseline for each indicator. From those discussions, preliminary targets were set for each indicator for each year included within the State Performance Plan (SPP). Preliminary targets were shared with local program leaders during a monthly Leadership Call and with the ICC during the quarterly meeting of the ICC. Each target was finalized through a vote of the ICC.

Discussion specific to this indicator focused on the continued impact of Minnesota's heightened efforts to inform all primary referral sources through the Help Me Grow public awareness campaign, changes made to a state data system which mandates referrals from child protective services and enhanced convenience for primary referral sources of the automated referral conduit, implemented during June of 2014.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	5,449	

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

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013	7/2/2015	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	208,464	

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
5,449	208,464	2.49%	2.53%	2.61%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find



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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		83.40%	86.30%	83.90%	83.40%	77.30%	90.70%	93.60%	91.10%	97.85%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

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
200	220	97.85%	100%	98.64%

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)

17

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.

Data for this indicator has been collected through MDE's Minnesota Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (MNCIMP) web-based data system. The MNCIMP web-based data system is used in part for gathering data from record reviews completed as part of compliance monitoring. Compliance monitoring of Early Intervention (EI) programs occurs through the monitoring of the Local Education Agencies (LEAs) through special education administrative units (SEAs) which have been scheduled on a five-year cycle. In year one of the cycle, the LEA conducts a self-review of records. In year two, the LEA must demonstrate correction of any noncompliance identified in the self-review consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. In year three, MDE conducts an on-site review of the LEA including a review of student records, facilities, and the LEA's Total Special Education System (TSES). In year four of the cycle, the LEA must demonstrate correction of noncompliance identified during the MDE review and implement any corrective action, again consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. The fifth year of the cycle is used to verify results of the implemented corrective action plan. In FFY 2015, MDE moved to a six year monitoring cycle. The sixth year of the cycle will be an additional year for LEAs to implement corrective action and changes to their systems prior to the start of the new monitoring cycle and self-review of records.

As part of the record review, a computer-generated sample is used to determine the EI records to be reviewed. Records are selected from the most recent SEAU enrollment data and are chosen in order to be accurately representative of the SEAU as a whole. Selection is based on a stratified random sampling with consideration given to race/ethnicity, age,

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

and gender. During the record review, the most current Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) and corresponding due process documentation are monitored to determine that legal standards are met.

Data for this indicator are gathered from examining records of children receiving Part C services and determining whether the services were provided in a timely manner. The FFY 2014 data are based on MDE reviews and LEA self-review of 56 SEAs, comprised of 131 individual districts.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

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
5	4	1	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

SEAs with identified noncompliance are required to develop Corrective Action Plans (CAPs), with a subsequent review of early intervention records, in order to demonstrate the SEA is now correctly implementing 34 CFR § 303.310. The SEAs must track timelines for a minimum of three months to verify the SEA is in 100% compliance with the timeline. The SEAs submit Letters of Assurance along with information on the records that were reviewed, assuring that the SEA is now in compliance. MDE has reviewed additional data from subsequent early intervention record reviews conducted as part of an on-site review by MDE or by the SEA as part of a Corrective Action Plan. 170 additional records have been subsequently reviewed to verify that the SEAs are now correctly implementing 34 CFR § 303.310. One SEA was unable to successfully complete the Corrective Action Plan within the required one year timeframe but has since demonstrated compliance and completed the Corrective Action Plan.

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

All record review data from FFY 2013 was collected through MDE's MNCIMP web-based data system. Once noncompliance is identified, it is tracked through the same web-based data system, which includes a compliance tracking system. For post-referral timelines, when record reviews are completed and data entered into the MNCIMP system, data is requested detailing the date of the referral, the date the evaluation and assessments were completed, and the date of the IFSP meeting. This allows MDE to verify that the evaluations and assessments and IFSP meetings have been completed, although they may have been late. If the date the evaluations and assessments were completed or the date of the IFSP meeting is missing, MDE requires the district to submit the completed IFSP to demonstrate the evaluation and assessments and IFSP meeting has been completed, although late. If the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the SEA, the SEA must submit to MDE the reason (moved, for example) and the date of the occurrence to release the district from further demonstration of correction for that specific child. Based on a review of the data, MDE verified all of the evaluations and assessments and IFSP meetings had been completed and that each SEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator had completed the evaluations and assessments and IFSP meetings, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation and assessment and IFSP meeting was not timely unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the SEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. All correction of individual student record noncompliance was completed within the one year timeframe.

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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



- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the 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		80.40%	87.00%	91.00%	95.30%	99.00%	100%	93.00%	95.00%	99.19%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

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



Yes



No

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
108	109	99.19%	100%	99.08%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services)

0

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



State monitoring

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

Data for this indicator has been collected through MDE's Minnesota Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (MNCIMP) web-based data system. The MNCIMP web-based data system is used in part for gathering data from record reviews completed as part of compliance monitoring. Compliance monitoring of Early Intervention (EI) programs occurs through the monitoring of the Local Education Agencies (LEAs) through special education administrative units (SEAUs) which have been scheduled on a five-year cycle. In year one of the cycle, the LEA conducts a self-review of records. In year two, the LEA must demonstrate correction of any noncompliance identified in the self-review consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. In year three, MDE conducts an on-site review of the LEA including a review of EI records, facilities, and the LEA's Total Special Education System (TSES). In year four of the cycle, the LEA must demonstrate correction of noncompliance identified during the MDE review and implement any corrective action, again consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. The fifth year of the cycle is used to verify results of the implemented corrective action plan. In FFY 2015, MDE moved to a six year monitoring cycle. The sixth year of the cycle will be an additional year for LEAs to implement corrective action and changes to their systems prior to the start of the new monitoring cycle and self-review of records..

As part of the record review, a computer-generated sample is used to determine the EI records to be reviewed. Records are selected from the most recent SEAU enrollment data and are chosen in order to be accurately representative of the SEAU as a whole. Selection is based on a stratified random sampling with consideration given to race/ethnicity, age, and gender. During the record review, the most current Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) and corresponding due process documentation are monitored to determine that legal standards are met.

Data for this indicator are gathered from examining records of children exiting Part C services and determining whether the IFSPs included transition steps and services. The FFY 2014 data are based on MDE reviews and LEA self-review of 56 SEAUs, comprised of 131 individual districts.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

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
11	11	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

SEAUs with identified noncompliance are required to develop Corrective Action Plans (CAPs), with a subsequent review of early intervention records, in order to demonstrate the SEAU is now correctly implementing 34 CFR § 303.344. The SEAUs must review additional records to verify that each record includes an IFSP with appropriate transition steps and services. The SEAUs submit Letters of Assurance along with information on the early intervention records that were reviewed, assuring that the SEAU is now in compliance. MDE has reviewed additional data from subsequent record reviews conducted as part of an on-site review by MDE or by the SEAU as part of a Corrective Action Plan to verify that the SEAUs are now correctly implementing 34 CFR § 303.344.

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

All record review data from FFY 2013 was collected through MDE's MNCIMP web-based data system. Once noncompliance is identified, it is tracked through the same web-based data system which includes a compliance tracking system. For correction of noncompliance, the SEAUs must submit documentation to MDE as demonstration of correction. Resubmission is required until the program can demonstrate correction. If the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the SEAU, the SEAU must submit to MDE the reason (moved, for example) and the date of the occurrence to release the district from further demonstration of correction for that specific child. Based on a review of the data, MDE verified all of the IFSPs included the required transition steps and services and that each SEAU with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator had corrected all identified noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the SEAU, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. All SEAUs were able to demonstrate correction of the identified noncompliance within the one year timeframe.

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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



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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA



Yes



No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
92	92	100%	100%	100%

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

Describe the method used to collect these data

MDE includes the following among the "statement of assurances" required to be signed annually by local Early Intervention

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

Program administrators prior to receipt of Part C funds. This has been accepted by OSEP as a component of Minnesota's Part C Application.

The state confirms notification of LEAs by local early intervention programs as required by the annual statement of assurances.

"The Part C program must provide notification to the State Education Agency (SEA) and the appropriate Local Education Agency (LEA) no fewer than 90 days prior to the child's third birthday, for those children who are potentially eligible for Part B services. 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1)-(2). However, per MDE policy, this notification only needs to be provided to the LEA, who is acting as an agent of the SEA for this specific purpose, to satisfy the notification requirements."

Do you have a written opt-out policy? No

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.

Data for this indicator has been collected through MDE's Minnesota Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (MNCIMP) web-based data system. The MNCIMP web-based data system is used in part for gathering data from record reviews completed as part of compliance monitoring. Compliance monitoring of Early Intervention (EI) programs occurs through the monitoring of the Local Education Agencies (LEAs) through special education administrative units (SEAs) which have been scheduled on a five-year cycle. In year one of the cycle, the LEA conducts a self-review of records. In year two, the LEA must demonstrate correction of any noncompliance identified in the self-review consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. In year three, MDE conducts an on-site review of the LEA including a review of student records, facilities, and the LEA's Total Special Education System (TSES). In year four of the cycle, the LEA must demonstrate correction of noncompliance identified during the MDE review and implement any corrective action, again consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. The fifth year of the cycle is used to verify results of the implemented corrective action plan. In FFY 2015, MDE moved to a six year monitoring cycle. The sixth year of the cycle will be an additional year for LEAs to implement corrective action and changes to their systems prior to the start of the new monitoring cycle and self-review of records.

As part of the record review, a computer-generated sample is used to determine the EI records to be reviewed. Records are selected from the most recent SEAU enrollment data and are chosen in order to be accurately representative of the SEAU as a whole. Selection is based on a stratified random sampling with consideration given to race/ethnicity, age, and gender. During the record review, the most current Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) and corresponding due process documentation are monitored to determine that legal standards are met.

Data for this indicator are gathered from examining records of children exiting Part C services. The FFY 2014 data are based on MDE reviews and LEA self-review of 56 SEAs, comprised of 131 individual districts. Since Education is the lead agency for both Part C and Part B services, the notification of the LEA is a seamless process.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

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

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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



- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the 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		30.35%	50.00%	59.00%	95.60%	92.00%	91.00%	99.00%	99.00%	98.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

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



Yes



No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
92	92	98.00%	100%	100%

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

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

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)

0

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.

Data for this indicator has been collected through MDE's Minnesota Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (MNCIMP) web-based data system. The MNCIMP web-based data system is used in part for gathering data from record reviews completed as part of compliance monitoring. Compliance monitoring of Early Intervention (EI) programs occurs through the monitoring of the Local Education Agencies (LEAs) through special education administrative units (SEAUs) which have been scheduled on a five-year cycle. In year one of the cycle, the LEA conducts a self-review of records. In year two, the LEA must demonstrate correction of any noncompliance identified in the self-review consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. In year three, MDE conducts an on-site review of the LEA including a review of student records, facilities, and the LEA's Total Special Education System (TSES). In year four of the cycle, the LEA must demonstrate correction of noncompliance identified during the MDE review and implement any corrective action, again consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. The fifth year of the cycle is used to verify results of the implemented corrective action plan. In FFY 2015, MDE moved to a six year monitoring cycle. The sixth year of the cycle will be an additional year for LEAs to implement corrective action and changes to their systems prior to the start of the new monitoring cycle and self-review of records.

As part of the record review, a computer-generated sample is used to determine the early intervention records to be reviewed. Records are selected from the most recent SEAU enrollment data and are chosen in order to be accurately representative of the SEAU as a whole. Selection is based on a stratified random sampling with consideration given to race/ethnicity, age and gender. During the record review, the most current Evaluation Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) and corresponding due process documentation are monitored to determine that legal standards are met.

Data for this indicator are gathered from examining records of children exiting Part C services and determining whether a transition conference was held during the required timeframe for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B. The FFY 2014 data are based on MDE reviews and LEA self-review of 56 SEAUs, comprised of 131 individual districts.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

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
4	4	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

SEAUs with identified noncompliance are required to develop Corrective Action Plans (CAPs), with a subsequent review of early intervention records, in order to demonstrate the SEAU is now correctly implementing 34 CFR § 303.209. The SEAUs must review additional records to verify that each toddler potentially eligible for Part B has had a transition conference within the required timeframe. The SEAUs submit Letters of Assurance along with information on the early intervention records that were reviewed, assuring that the SEAU is now in compliance. MDE has reviewed additional data from subsequent early intervention record reviews conducted as part of an on-site review by MDE or by the SEAU as part of a Corrective Action Plan. Over 118 additional records have been subsequently reviewed to verify that the SEAUs are now correctly implementing 34 CFR § 303.209. All SEAUs were able to complete their CAPs within the one year time frame.

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

All record review data from FFY 2013 was collected through MDE's MNCIMP web-based data system. Once noncompliance is identified, it is tracked through the same web-based data system which includes a compliance tracking system. For Part C to Part B transition timelines, when record reviews are completed and data entered into the MNCIMP system, data is requested detailing the date of the transition conference. This allows MDE to verify that the transition conference has been completed, although it may have been late. If the date of the transition conference is missing, MDE requires the district to submit the IFSP to demonstrate the transition conference has been held, although late. If the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the SEAU or being served under Part C, the SEAU must submit to MDE the reason (moved, for example) and the date of the occurrence to release the district from further demonstration of correction for that specific student. Based on a review of the data, MDE verified all of the transition conferences had been completed and that each SEAU with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator had completed the transition conference, although late, for any child whose transition conference was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the SEAU or being served under Part C, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. MDE verified that all individual early intervention record noncompliance was corrected within the one year.

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

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:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	n	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	n	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
0	0			

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 10: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥				83.00%						
Data					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 ≥					

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan



Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014
Target		
Data		60.30%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target				

Key:

Description of Measure

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Overview

Data Analysis

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

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

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

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

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

Statement

Description

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

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

Theory of Action

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

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted



Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

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: Lisa Backer

Title: Education Supervisor

Email: lisa.backer@state.mn.us

Phone: 651-582-8473