

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:
Part C**

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

**For reporting on
FFY18**



PART C DUE February 3, 2020

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

The Rhode Island Executive Office of Health and Human Services (EOHHS) has completed the FFY 2018 State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) based on the Rhode Island Early Intervention Care Coordination System (RIEICCS) data system; focused monitoring of all Early Intervention Providers, and the Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA) Center's Family Survey (revised version: 2-5-10).

Although Rhode Island experienced a slight slippage in Indicator 7 and some slippage in Indicator 3, the Early Intervention programs continue to ensure high quality and compliance while dealing with significant staff turnover during this year. Slippage in Indicator 3 can be associated with the new process and procedures implemented to collect these data beginning in 2016 (More details in Indicator 3 explanation of slippage).

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 Rhode Island (RI) EI General Supervision System incorporates eight components that interact and inform each other to ensure implementation of IDEA and to identify and correct non-compliance. Specific components include the following:

- 1.State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and other state selected monitoring indicators
- 2.Rhode Island Early Intervention Certification Standards
- 3.Fiscal Management and Oversight
- 4.Complaints/Dispute Resolution System
- 5.Rhode Island Early Intervention Care Coordination System (RIEICCS) (web-based data collection system)
- 6.Integrated Monitoring Activities (e.g., annual desk audit, on site focused monitoring visits, Early Intervention provider self-assessments)
- 7.Professional Development and Technical Assistance (TA) System
- 8.Performance Improvement Plans, Corrective Action Plans, Incentives and Sanctions

The RI EOHHS utilizes RI's General Supervision System to ensure compliance with IDEA and RI EI Certification Standards. There are three main sources of data used for the SPP/APR. The web-based data collection system, RIEICCS, is used to report statewide and program specific data for Indicators 2, 3, 5 & 6 as required by OSEP. ECTA's Family Survey (revised version: 2-5-10) is used to gather data for Indicator 4. Focused monitoring data is used for indicators 1, 7, 8 and 9. All 9 certified EI providers participate in focused monitoring annually. Providers utilize a state-wide self-assessment tool and a list of State selected records including 10% of each provider's enrollment during January 1-June 30 (or at least 20 records). Records reviewed for Indicator 8 include 10% of those discharged during the same time period (or at least 10 records). The lead agency review team (which includes CSPD staff) then conducts site-based visits to all certified EI providers every year to review 25% of the records (or a minimum of 10) from the self-assessment in order to verify accuracy of the data. These on-site record reviews provide an opportunity for gathering data for federal reporting and as a mechanism for identification of technical assistance and professional development needs. The state also reviews any and all complaints (including informal complaints), mediations, and due process hearings to identify performance issues and non-compliance.

EI providers are required to submit detailed explanations for all findings of non-compliance and to conduct an analysis of the root cause for all findings. The lead agency verifies that each EI provider with non-compliance correctly implements regulatory requirements. Corrective Action Plans are required for all findings of non-compliance and must include an analysis of the root cause of the non-compliance along with strategies (including timelines) to correct the non-compliance. Periodic reporting on the Corrective Action Plans is also required until evidence of correction of each finding is submitted and verified by the lead agency. The lead agency requires evidence of correction of any and all findings as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the identification of the finding. The lead agency may also require Performance Improvement Plans on selected performance indicators and/or State selected quality measures. State determinations are made annually for all certified EI providers in RI in accordance with OSEP. Programs that "Meet Requirements" are awarded an incentive payment. Programs that do not "Meet Requirements" are given sanctions that may include: additional reporting requirements; specific directives to address the root cause for the non-compliance; increased ongoing on-site monitoring and technical assistance; closure to new referrals; change of certification status, financial sanctions; and termination of certification.

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 RI Executive Office of Health and Human Services utilizes a contract with the Paul V. Sherlock Center on Disabilities at Rhode Island College (RI's University Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities) to ensure the timely and effective delivery of high quality and evidence-based technical assistance and support to RI's EI system. The Sherlock Center has been providing technical assistance to RI's Early Intervention system since 2001. The Part C team at EOHHS and the technical assistance team work closely together to identify the Part C system needs utilizing any related data, create a work plan related to technical assistance, assign tasks among the team, and meet regularly to ensure that action items are completed inform.

The Sherlock center is responsible for the assessment, planning, development, management, and oversight of an ongoing and comprehensive system of technical assistance. The technical assistance system incorporates the needs of EOHHS, EI providers and personnel, community partners and referral sources, and families regarding the requirements and purpose of IDEA, the RI EI Certification Standards, and other national best practices for working with young children with special needs and their families. Responsibilities to EOHHS and individual EI providers include, but are not limited to:

- Provision of technical assistance related to the collection, analysis, and use of data to guide decision making, program planning, and potential system changes.
- Continuous assessment of the RI EI system needs to develop and implement strategies that support the assurance of high quality and compliance with federal and state requirements.
- Support and assistance to EOHHS for individual EI provider oversight and monitoring, review and revision of state policies and standards, and public awareness materials.
- Serve as the state EI Transition Coordinator to build and maintain a collaborative relationship with the Rhode Island Department of Education's (RIDE) Preschool Special Education team. This includes assistance to EOHHS to review, develop, and monitor the ongoing Interagency Agreement with RIDE that includes effective, collaborative policies related to the efficient transitions for children and their families from EI into the Preschool Education system.

This includes the assessment, development, and implementation of professional development activities to ensure compliance with IDEA and the RI EI Certification standards at the provider and state levels.

Professional Development System:

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

The RI Executive Office of Health and Human Services utilizes a contract with the Paul V. Sherlock Center on Disabilities at Rhode Island College (RI's University Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities) to ensure that EI providers are effectively providing services that improve outcomes for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The Sherlock Center has been providing professional development to RI's Early Intervention system since 2001. The Part C team at EOHHS and the professional development team work closely together to identify the Part C system needs utilizing relative data, create a work plan related to professional development, assign tasks among the team, and meet regularly to ensure that action items are completed. Responsibilities under this contract include:

- The development, implementation, and continuous evaluation of RI's Part C Comprehensive System of Personnel Development. This includes specific focus on recruitment/retention, increasing workforce capacity, providing effective professional development, and developing leadership with the goal that the Part C workforce understands and implements the principles and practices of EI to improve outcomes for children and families.
- The assessment, development, and implementation of professional development to ensure that EI providers understand and effectively incorporate evidence-based practices into the service delivery model to improve outcomes for children and families.
- Develop and provide professional development opportunities that relate to the RI EI Competencies that support the Key Principles and Practices of EI as well as IDEA requirements.
- Assist and support EI providers to ensure the RI EI Competencies are the basis for job descriptions, program level training and supervision, and individualized professional development plans.
- Based on the RI EI Competencies, manage the EI Certificate Program to provide a career path for Level 1 providers to become Level 2.
- Develop and ensure that all new EI providers attend the 4-day Introduction to EI course. The training is based on IDEA requirements, RI EI Certification Standards, EI Principals and Practices, EI Competencies and is focused on the pragmatic skills of relationship-based work. The content is delivered in a multi-modality, activity-based, interactive curriculum and is formatted to follow the EI process beginning with Eligibility through Transition. A main focus is on the IFSP development process that now includes the use of the Routines Based Interview as a tool to develop family-owned, functional, and measurable outcomes that are embedded in the family's daily routine. Experienced EI provider staff serve as "mentors" during each session and presenters include a mix of parents and professionals from all aspects of EI such as: a panel of parents who have been through the EI system; the Part C Coordinator; a developmental behavioral pediatrician; and the state CAPTA liaison.
- Provide trainings to individual EI providers that meet individual needs related to EI processes and procedures and the implementation of SSIP activities.
- Develop and lead the monthly EI Supervisor's Seminar for program supervisors co-facilitated by an infant mental health consultant. The seminars focus on skill building, reflective practices, networking and resource sharing, and leadership support.
- Conduct a professional development needs assessment followed by the provision of topical trainings that are based on the assessment. These trainings are evaluated for content to ensure its relevancy to the EI service delivery model and that the content will have an impact on supporting the EI principles and practices.
- Provide conference sponsorships to support EI provider directors, supervisors and direct-service staff to participate in national/regional opportunities.
- Coordinate and lead meetings with representatives from each program and representatives from Lead Education Agencies that include professional development and technical assistance that align with the RI EI Certification Standards and the EI Competencies related to Transition.
- Coordinate and lead low-incidence population (i.e. autism, D/HH, Visual Impairments) Community of Practice groups to provide up-to-date information, interventions, and community connections.

Stakeholder Involvement:

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

The RI Executive Office of Health and Human Services (EOHHS) conducted presentations to provide information to and gather input from stakeholders related to RI's State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Reports, current and historical data and targets for both compliance and improvement indicators, and previous and ongoing strategies for improvement. These presentations and materials were used with the state's administrative team, the state's ICC, and the state's EI Director's group. Each of these groups were given the opportunity to make suggestions for new targets through FFY2018 and provide ideas for new or continued improvement strategies. The input from these presentations was compiled and utilized to set the new targets which was then reported back to each of the stakeholder groups for final review and comment. All of the groups agreed to the final targets.

For FFY 2019 target setting, a similar stakeholder involvement process was used with stakeholders from the state's ICC and EI Directors group. In addition to the process already described, the groups reviewed historical data and past targets, to suggest new targets. Targets from all groups were averaged for a final target which was approved by the state's ICC.

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

YES

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2017 performance of each EIS Program located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2017 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, is available.

EOHHS presented FFY 2017 performance on each RI EI provider on the targets in the SPP/APR (all indicators, measurement requirements, previous and current data, and improvement strategies) with the RI State ICC and the EI Director's group in January of 2019.

The following link was made publicly available on 4/2019:

<http://www.eohhs.ri.gov/ProvidersPartners/EarlyInterventionProviders/EICertificationStandards.aspx>

Included on this link are the following documents:

- 1.FFY 2017 APR data for each indicator by provider and collectively for RI's Part C system
- 2.FFY 2017 State Performance Plan
- 3.FFY2017 SSIP Report

RI ICC members, EI providers, and interested parties are informed electronically about the availability of these publications on the EOHHS website including a link to the federal OSEP website.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Intro - OSEP Response

States were instructed to submit Phase III, Year Four, of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), indicator C-11, by April 1, 2020. The State provided the required information. The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the target.

Intro - Required Actions

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

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

Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Family Service Plans(IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	64.81%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	95.42%	97.91%	96.40%	90.69%	93.98%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
209	260	93.98%	100%	93.46%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

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

Include your State’s criteria for “timely” receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

Rhode Island’s definition of timely services is that any initial or new service added to the IFSP must start within 30 days from the date the parent signed consent for the service.

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

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

All EI Certified providers are selected for program monitoring.

If needed, provide additional information about this indicator here.

Reasons for not meeting the timeline for FY18 that were discovered during focused monitoring and that the EI providers reported in their corrective action plans are as follows: individual staff error/oversight; staff turnover/lack of staff to provide the service; staff illness causing cancelled appointments; and, insufficient documentation of exceptional family circumstances.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	6	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The 6 RI timely service findings of noncompliance are corrected. Reasons for not meeting the timeline that were discovered during focused monitoring and that the EI providers reported in their corrective action plans are as follows: staffing shortages for speech, occupational, and speech therapists; although visits occurred within 30 days, the documentation did not adequately reflect the services listed on the IFSP; individual staff error; and, insufficient documentation of exceptional family circumstances.

The State has verified that each EIS provider with each noncompliance reported by the State in FFY17 under this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has initiated services for each child, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). The Executive Office of Health and Human Services monitored each EIS program through the Welligent data system, yearly program self-assessment, and on-site verification of data. The process included evaluating each provider for an annual determination; notifying each provider of any identified findings of non-compliance; and notifying each provider of any required actions. Each program submitted a Corrective Action Plan for each finding of non-compliance identified in FFY2017 related to timely services on the IFSP. The Corrective Action Plan included a program analysis of the root cause for the non-compliance and action steps with responsible parties and dates to correct the identified issues that led to non-compliance. Upon completion of the Corrective Action Plan, each program submitted a data sample that was 100% compliant to close each finding of non-compliance.

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

The 6 Timely Service findings in FFY17 involved 15 individual cases of non-compliance. The state verified through the State’s process of Focused Monitoring that the 15 children received the early intervention services on their IFSP, although late.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

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

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	91.41%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target>=	94.00%	94.20%	94.40%	94.60%	94.80%
Data	95.78%	96.71%	98.07%	98.94%	99.01%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=	95.00%	97.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The RI Executive Office of Health and Human Services (EOHHS) conducted presentations to provide information to and gather input from stakeholders related to RI's State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Reports, current and historical data and targets for both compliance and improvement indicators, and previous and ongoing strategies for improvement. These presentations and materials were used with the state's administrative team, the state's ICC, and the state's EI Director's group. Each of these groups were given the opportunity to make suggestions for new targets through FFY2018 and provide ideas for new or continued improvement strategies. The input from these presentations was compiled and utilized to set the new targets which was then reported back to each of the stakeholder groups for final review and comment. All of the groups agreed to the final targets.

For FFY 2019 target setting, a similar stakeholder involvement process was used with stakeholders from the state's ICC and EI Directors group. In addition to the process already described, the groups reviewed historical data and past targets, to suggest new targets. Targets from all groups were averaged for a final target which was approved by the state's ICC.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	2,113
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	2,123

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2,113	2,123	99.01%	95.00%	99.53%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

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

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

Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3 - Indicator Data

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The RI Executive Office of Health and Human Services (EOHHS) conducted presentations to provide information to and gather input from stakeholders related to RI's State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Reports, current and historical data and targets for both compliance and improvement indicators, and previous and ongoing strategies for improvement. These presentations and materials were used with the state's administrative team, the state's ICC, and the state's EI Director's group. Each of these groups were given the opportunity to make suggestions for new targets through FFY2018 and provide ideas for new or continued improvement strategies. The input from these presentations was compiled and utilized to set the new targets which was then reported back to each of the stakeholder groups for final review and comment. All of the groups agreed to the final targets.

For FFY 2019 target setting, a similar stakeholder involvement process was used with stakeholders from the state's ICC and EI Directors group. In addition to the process already described, the groups reviewed historical data and past targets, to suggest new targets. Targets from all groups were averaged for a final target which was approved by the state's ICC.

For indicator 3, the process also included a baseline revision as well as a target revision. The need for a baseline revision was due to the fact that the original targets were set from baseline data that were collected from a different collection method than how the data are collected now. Rhode Island changed the child outcomes measurement process in 2016, and therefore the original targets were set from baseline data that was collected with a different process than the current data collection method. Due to the change in the data collection process, these baselines and targets are no longer meaningful for this indicator.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2018	Target>=	67.90%	68.00%	68.20%	68.80%	70.00%
A1	51.20%	Data	67.91%	65.23%	67.22%	57.36%	50.78%
A2	2018	Target>=	57.00%	57.20%	57.40%	57.60%	57.80%
A2	47.10%	Data	57.84%	54.75%	57.48%	54.49%	50.87%
B1	2018	Target>=	74.00%	74.20%	74.60%	74.80%	75.00%
B1	56.00%	Data	75.09%	73.09%	74.12%	65.26%	57.23%
B2	2018	Target>=	54.70%	54.70%	54.80%	54.80%	55.00%
B2	39.51%	Data	52.08%	51.21%	52.34%	46.22%	40.53%
C1	2018	Target>=	70.00%	70.50%	71.00%	71.50%	72.00%
C1	63.06%	Data	76.69%	74.80%	78.66%	68.21%	63.47%
C2	2018	Target>=	54.00%	54.20%	54.40%	54.60%	54.80%
C2	48.26%	Data	54.02%	53.89%	59.48%	52.15%	51.60%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1>=		52.00%
Target A2>=		48.00%
Target B1>=		57.00%
Target B2>=		41.00%
Target C1>=		64.00%
Target C2>=		49.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

1,463

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	16	1.09%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	565	38.62%

	Number of children	Percentage of Total
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	193	13.19%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	393	26.86%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	296	20.23%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	586	1,167	50.78%		50.21%	N/A	N/A
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	689	1,463	50.87%		47.10%	N/A	N/A

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	19	1.30%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	571	39.03%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	295	20.16%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	456	31.17%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	122	8.34%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	751	1,341	57.23%		56.00%	N/A	N/A
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	578	1,463	40.53%		39.51%	N/A	N/A

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	12	0.82%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	483	33.01%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	262	17.91%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	583	39.85%

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	123	8.41%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	845	1,340	63.47%		63.06%	N/A	N/A
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	706	1,463	51.60%		48.26%	N/A	N/A

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

The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's part C exiting 618 data	2,258
The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.	671

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

Rhode Island Part C Early Intervention (EI) in collaboration with Part B 619, Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), has developed one aligned child outcomes measurement process for both systems. Rhode Island's EI/ECSE Global Child Outcomes Measurement System is based on the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process developed by the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA). RI EI providers complete the COS process at entry (by the initial IFSP start date), after the acquisition of pertinent functional child and family information that may include: standardized tools, observations, parent report, family assessment, Routines Based Interview, medical records, and information gathered from outside sources. The same process is completed at exit (prior to discharge), along with the determination of progress while participating in EI. RI has integrated the COS into the IFSP process so that the present levels of development are organized using the framework of the Global Child Outcomes. This provides more support and evidence to the team to ensure accurate ratings. For children transitioning to Part B 619, the exit rating discussion occurs in collaboration with the LEA and the family. The collaborative rating is used as Part C's exit rating and Part B 619's entry rating. For those children not transitioning to Part B 619, the team meets with the family prior to discharge to discuss and decide on a rating as part of the discharge process.

The COS/IFSP Process includes:

1. Gathering rich information about child and/or functioning from multiple sources. These include, but are not limited to: family members/caregivers, other adults who know the child such as a child care provider, and other service and/or medical providers.
2. Gathering rich information about child and/or family functioning utilizing multiple methods. These include, but are not limited to: child/family observation, semi-structured parent/caregiver interviews, parent report, review of medical records, standardized and criterion-based assessment/evaluation tools (examples: Routines Based Interview®, Baley Scales of Infant Development 3, Battelle Developmental Inventory 2-NU, Hawaii Early Learning Profile®, and the Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System®).
3. Using guidance tools developed by RI's EI Technical Assistance center to support discussions with families and caregivers including the RI Functional outcomes Discussion Sheet, Guiding Questions for Families and Guiding Questions for Teachers and Other Caregivers.
4. Using ECTA's COS rating scale, summary statements, Decision Making Tree, and other guidance from ECTA.
5. Entry ratings on all children who enter RI EI, exit ratings for those children enrolled at least 6 months in EI, and the progress question (at exit) are entered into RIEICCS database.
6. Individual EI providers have the ability to download their own child outcomes data to view and ensure completion and reliability.
7. EOHHS (lead agency) utilizes various tools developed by ECTA and DaSy to analyze meaningful differences and trends.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For FFY18, Rhode Island has changed its baseline and targets for Indicator three. The following is a justification for these changes.

Rhode Island changed the child outcomes measurement process in November of 2016 through a collaborative project with Part B 619 to develop one child outcomes measurement system for both programs. Due to this, the original targets were set from baseline data that was collected with a different process than the current data collection method. Because of the change in the child outcomes measurement process, these baselines and targets are no longer meaningful for this indicator. This change in process has resulted in an unexpected and significant downward change in RI's child outcomes data for both summary statements within all three outcomes.

In FFY18 there continues to be a downward trend in both Summary Statements and all three outcomes although the data appear to be stabilizing. Utilizing ECTA's Child Outcomes Year-to-Year Meaningful Differences Calculator for States, RI has determined that the amount of change for A1, B1,

B2, and C1 is insignificant in FFY18. For A2 the amount of change in FFY18 was determined to be significant, although the amount of change is smaller in FFY18 than in FFY17. For C2, although the amount of change is greater in FFY18 than the change from FFY16 to FFY17, the amount of change is smaller than FFY-15-FFY16. The reason for this continued downward trend in FFY18 is that the data in FFY18 include children who were rated at entry in the old child outcomes measurement process yet rated at exit in the current process (236/1463 children). Although the number of children entering and exiting in different processes is smaller in FFY18 than previous years, this continues to impact our data. When the two groups are compared, children who entered and exited in the current process show more progress than those who did not. (See Attachment: RI-Indicator-3-Comparison-of-Change-FFY18.)

Further analysis of RI data for A2 and C2 shows that the percent of "d" and "e" in FFY18 has decreased as compared to FFY17. In order to see improvement in A2 and C2, we would have to see an increase in the percentage of children in categories "d" and "e", however the largest increase in percentage was in "c." (See Attachment: RI-Indicator-3-Change-in-Categories-for-Outcomes-A-C-FFY18). We believe that there are more children in "c" and less in "d" and "e" because staff are now more accurate with developing the rating. Survey data of direct care staff who are involved in the child outcomes measurement process showed that the majority of the staff (31/49) indicated that they were rating differently in the new process. It is believed that the change in child outcomes data may be because direct care staff are now able to provide more accurate ratings (with a more defined process, team approach, and having richer functional child information) in the new process. An example to support this hypothesis can be found when looking at the child outcomes data for children exiting to Part B 619. (See Attachment: RI-Indicator-3-Change-in-Categories-Children-Exit-to-PartB-FFY18). For this data set, we would expect to see lower numbers of "d" and "e" because of their special education eligibility status. As staff provide more accurate ratings, we would expect to see this change as these percentages are more reflective of the population of children who exit to Part B 619 services. Although the overall percentage of A2 and C2 was less in FFY18 than in FFY17, the data supports a positive change in more accurate rating practices by staff.

Components of the new child outcomes measurement process that support staff to rate more accurately include the following:

1. Professional development: Ten (10) comprehensive modules, based on the ECTA Child Outcomes modules are required to be completed by all staff. The new modules have provided a mechanism to ensure all staff have the same information about RI's child outcomes measurement process, thereby increasing the accuracy of the ratings.
2. Integration of Child Outcomes and the IFSP: The new process includes the integration of the three child outcomes into the IFSP for entry ratings. The child outcomes process is no longer seen as an ancillary form without much purpose to the provider. Instead, it has been transformed into an invaluable part of the IFSP process ensuring a comprehensive collection of functional child and family information to be used as a basis in determining entry ratings.
3. Integration of Child Outcomes into the transition process for Part B 619: The new process includes a collaborative rating completed by Part B 619 and Part C which is used as the Part C exit rating and the Part B 619 entry rating. This aligned systems collaboration ensures that a comprehensive collection and review of information was the foundation for the determination of the rating.
4. Team Approach: The new process requires a team approach which includes the family. The team approach ensures that a comprehensive collection and review of information was the foundation for the determination of the rating.

RI therefore has revised the baseline for Indicator 3 because the change in the child outcomes measurement process has significantly impacted RI's data, in that, (a) an abrupt and substantial change in scores immediately followed the implementation of the new process; (b) a substantial difference in scores: and, (c) a consistent difference (both size and direction) across the outcome measures. RI has established an FFY 19 target based on a revised baseline using the current year (FFY18) child outcomes data. Due to this new baseline, no target is set for FFY18. In addition, RI will re-examine targets in FFY 19 to determine if they are meaningful considering that there will still be a very small amount children who entered in the old Child Outcomes Measurement Process and will exit in the current process.

3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3 - Required Actions

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

4 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2006	Target>=	90.00%	90.20%	90.40%	90.60%	90.80%
A	87.89%	Data	91.76%	91.97%	89.40%	91.68%	91.41%
B	2006	Target>=	94.00%	94.00%	94.20%	94.60%	94.80%
B	91.40%	Data	94.02%	94.82%	92.76%	94.70%	94.78%
C	2006	Target>=	94.50%	94.50%	94.50%	94.50%	94.50%
C	93.90%	Data	93.37%	94.10%	91.07%	92.90%	92.40%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A>=	91.00%	92.00%
Target B>=	95.00%	96.00%
Target C>=	94.50%	94.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The RI Executive Office of Health and Human Services (EOHHS) conducted presentations to provide information to and gather input from stakeholders related to RI's State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Reports, current and historical data and targets for both compliance and improvement indicators, and previous and ongoing strategies for improvement. These presentations and materials were used with the state's administrative team, the state's ICC, and the state's EI Director's group. Each of these groups were given the opportunity to make suggestions for new targets through FFY2018 and provide ideas for new or continued improvement strategies. The input from these presentations was compiled and utilized to set the new targets which was then reported back to each of the stakeholder groups for final review and comment. All of the groups agreed to the final targets.

For FFY 2019 target setting, a similar stakeholder involvement process was used with stakeholders from the state's ICC and EI Directors group. In

addition to the process already described, the groups reviewed historical data and past targets, to suggest new targets. Targets from all groups were averaged for a final target which was approved by the state's ICC.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	2,211
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	868
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	788
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	860
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	827
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	862
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	808
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	862

	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2)	91.41%	91.00%	91.63%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2)	94.78%	95.00%	95.94%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2)	92.40%	94.50%	93.74%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

	Yes / No
Was a collection tool used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised collection tool?	NO
The demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.	NO

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

The Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center's Family Survey (revised version-2-5-10) is used to gather data for Indicator 4. Scoring for A from the survey is the average of questions 1-5 "Very" or "Extremely" responses divided by the average number of responses. Scoring for B from the survey is the average of questions 6-11 "Very" or "Extremely" responses divided by the average number of responses. Scoring for C from the survey is the average of questions 12-17 "Very" or "Extremely" responses divided by the average number of responses.

The State Family Outcomes Survey Workgroup, consisting of representatives from each EI provider site, RI EI TA center, and the Rhode Island Parent Information Network (RIPIN), guides the data collection and analysis process. All families with an active IFSP (extracted on April 1, 2019) were either hand delivered or mailed a survey and given the option to complete the survey on-line via Survey Monkey. A non-EI provider was available to families who needed assistance to complete the survey in effort to ensure that all families have equal access to the survey. In addition, the survey is available in Spanish, Chinese, and Portuguese, and additional languages as requested. Each EI provider designates a Family Survey "Champion" as an effort to ensure that all families who are given or mailed the survey have the opportunity to complete it. RIPIN staff meets regularly with the EI "Champions" to provide updates and offer assistance as needed

This year's return rate (868/2211) was 39.26%. The Family Survey demographic data were analyzed using the ECTA Meaningful difference calculator and showed that the demographic data of the respondents are not representative of the demographics of children enrolled in the RI EI system (See Attachment: Family Outcomes Demographic Comparison). Analysis of the demographic questions on the survey indicates that we are unsure if the parent is identifying their race/ethnicity or the race/ethnicity of their child who is enrolled in EI. Due to this, we feel that our data is not reliable for this purpose at this time. Next year, the demographic question will be removed from the survey, and the returned responses will be matched to the demographic data that is in the RIECCS data system. This will ensure consistency and accuracy for a more reliable comparison in FFY19.

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

The Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center's Family Survey (revised version-2-5-10) is used to gather data for Indicator 4. Scoring for A from the survey is the average of questions 1-5 "Very" or "Extremely" responses divided by the average number of responses. Scoring for B from the survey is the average of questions 6-11 "Very" or "Extremely" responses divided by the average number of responses. Scoring for C from the survey is the average of questions 12-17 "Very" or "Extremely" responses divided by the average number of responses.

The State Family Outcomes Survey Workgroup, consisting of representatives from each EI provider site, RI EI TA center, and the Rhode Island Parent Information Network (RIPIN), guides the data collection and analysis process. All families with an active IFSP (extracted on April 1, 2019) were either hand delivered or mailed a survey and given the option to complete the survey on-line via Survey Monkey. A non-EI provider was available to families who needed assistance to complete the survey in effort to ensure that all families have equal access to the survey. In addition, the survey is available in Spanish, Chinese, and Portuguese, and additional languages as requested. Each EI provider designates a Family Survey "Champion" as an effort to ensure that all families who are given or mailed the survey have the opportunity to complete it. RIPIN staff meets regularly with the EI "Champions" to provide updates and offer assistance as needed

This year's return rate (868/2211) was 39.26%. The Family Survey demographic data were analyzed using the ECTA Meaningful difference calculator and showed that the demographic data of the respondents are not representative of the demographics of children enrolled in the RI EI system (See Attachment: RI-Family-Involvement-Demographic-Comparison-FFY18). Analysis of the demographic questions on the survey indicates that we are unsure if the parent is identifying their race/ethnicity or the race/ethnicity of their child who is enrolled in EI. Due to this, we feel that our data is not reliable for this purpose at this time. Next year, the demographic question will be removed from the survey, and the returned responses will be matched to the demographic data that is in the RIEICCS data system. This will ensure consistency and accuracy for a more reliable comparison in FFY19.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

4 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2019 response data are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program , and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the population.

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	1.86%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%
Data	2.89%	3.05%	2.75%	3.00%	2.60%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	2.50%	2.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The RI Executive Office of Health and Human Services (EOHHS) conducted presentations to provide information to and gather input from stakeholders related to RI's State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Reports, current and historical data and targets for both compliance and improvement indicators, and previous and ongoing strategies for improvement. These presentations and materials were used with the state's administrative team, the state's ICC, and the state's EI Director's group. Each of these groups were given the opportunity to make suggestions for new targets through FFY2018 and provide ideas for new or continued improvement strategies. The input from these presentations was compiled and utilized to set the new targets which was then reported back to each of the stakeholder groups for final review and comment. All of the groups agreed to the final targets.

For FFY 2019 target setting, a similar stakeholder involvement process was used with stakeholders from the state's ICC and EI Directors group. In addition to the process already described, the groups reviewed historical data and past targets, to suggest new targets. Targets from all groups were averaged for a final target which was approved by the state's ICC.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	331
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/20/2019	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	10,557

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
331	10,557	2.60%	2.50%	3.14%	Met Target	No Slippage

Compare your results to the national data

RI ranks 4th compared to all states and District of Columbia. RI ranks 1st compared to all non at-risk states.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Baseline	2005	4.09%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	3.80%	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%
Data	6.36%	6.36%	6.11%	6.07%	6.14%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	6.00%	6.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The RI Executive Office of Health and Human Services (EOHHS) conducted presentations to provide information to and gather input from stakeholders related to RI's State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Reports, current and historical data and targets for both compliance and improvement indicators, and previous and ongoing strategies for improvement. These presentations and materials were used with the state's administrative team, the state's ICC, and the state's EI Director's group. Each of these groups were given the opportunity to make suggestions for new targets through FFY2018 and provide ideas for new or continued improvement strategies. The input from these presentations was compiled and utilized to set the new targets which was then reported back to each of the stakeholder groups for final review and comment. All of the groups agreed to the final targets.

For FFY 2019 target setting, a similar stakeholder involvement process was used with stakeholders from the state's ICC and EI Directors group. In addition to the process already described, the groups reviewed historical data and past targets, to suggest new targets. Targets from all groups were averaged for a final target which was approved by the state's ICC.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	2,123
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/20/2019	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	32,465

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2,123	32,465	6.14%	6.00%	6.54%	Met Target	No Slippage

Compare your results to the national data

RI ranks 4th compared to all states and District of Columbia. RI ranks 1st compared to all non at-risk states.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

7 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	71.70%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.98%	96.20%	98.00%	95.95%	98.40%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
222	260	98.40%	100%	96.92%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Four providers were at 100% for this indicator in FFY18 and two providers improved from FFY17 (88% to 93% and 96% to 97%.) The other three providers experienced slippage (100% to 95%, 100% to 90% and 100% to 93%). Root causes for noncompliance included: individual staff error/oversight; procedural errors around intake and scheduling; and insufficient documentation of exceptional family circumstances. In addition, RI has experienced a high direct care staff turnover in FFY18 and feel that this may be related to the identified root causes listed. RI has begun to implement a state-wide fiscal plan with a focus on staff retention in efforts to reduce the influence of staff turnover to issues related to compliance.

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

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

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

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

All 9 RI Certified EI providers are included in monitoring.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Reasons for not meeting the timeline for FY18 that were discovered during focused monitoring and that the EI providers reported in their corrective action plans are as follows: individual staff error/oversight, procedural errors (intake/scheduling – provider waiting too late in the timeline to contact family), and insufficient documentation of exceptional family circumstances.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	2	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

2 RI 45-day Timeline findings have been corrected. Reasons for not meeting the timeline that were discovered during focused monitoring and that the EI providers reported in their corrective action plans are as follows: service coordination staffing shortages, procedural error (delay in assigning new referrals), and insufficient documentation of exceptional family circumstances. The State has verified that each EIS program with non compliance reported by the State in FFY17 under this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has initiated IFSPs for each child, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). The Executive Office of Health and Human Services monitored each EIS program through the Welligent data system, yearly program self-assessment, and on-site verification of data. The process included evaluating each provider for an annual determination; notifying each provider of any identified findings of non-compliance; and notifying each provider of any required actions. Each program submitted a Corrective Action Plan for each finding of non-compliance identified in FFY2017 related to the 45-day timeline. The Corrective Action Plan included a program analysis of the root cause for the non-compliance and action steps with responsible parties and dates to correct the identified issues that led to non-compliance. Upon completion of the Corrective Action Plan, each program submitted a data sample that was 100% compliant to close the finding of non-compliance.

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

The 2 45-day Timeline findings in FFY17 involved 4 individual cases of non-compliance. The state verified through the State’s process of Focused Monitoring that an IFSP was initiated for each child, although late.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

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

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	79.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.15%	96.81%	100.00%	99.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
102	103	100.00%	100%	99.03%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

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

0

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

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

All 9 RI EI providers are selected for monitoring.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

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

8A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8A - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

8A - Required Actions

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8B - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	96.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.28%	100.00%	100.00%	98.92%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

YES

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
101	103	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Number of parents who opted out

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

2

Describe the method used to collect these data

Rhode Island used data from both the RIEICCS database and data from the focused monitoring process to report on Indicator 8b.

Each EI provider collected and entered transition notification data into the RIEICCS data system including: potential eligibility for Part B 619 and the date of notification to the LEA or the date the parent opted out of notification (and/or opted back in, if applicable). Notification to the SEA was transmitted electronically from RIEICCS to the Part B data system for all children with IFSPs who are over the age of 28 months.

The state ensured validity of these data within the focused monitoring process. EI providers used a self-assessment record review tool, developed by EOHHS, that required the EI provider to verify compliance on all federal and state indicators and state quality measures. The expectation was that the program completed this review for a list of EOHHS selected records (10% of each program's enrollment during January 1 - June 30, 2019 or at least 20 records). Among these state selected records, 75% (or at least 20) were newly enrolled children, while the other 25% (at least 10) were children who transitioned to Part B 619 during that time period. The lead agency review team conducted focused monitoring site visits to all 9 RI EI providers to review 25% of the records (or a minimum of 10) from the self-assessment to verify the reliability and validity of the reported data.

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

YES

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

YES

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

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

All 9 RI EI providers are included in monitoring.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

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

8B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8B - OSEP Response

8B - Required Actions

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8C - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	91.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	88.14%	97.73%	100.00%	99.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
100	103	100.00%	100%	99.03%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

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

0

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

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

2

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

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

All 9 RI EI providers are included in monitoring.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The reason for not meeting the timeline for FY18 that were discovered during focused monitoring and that the EI providers reported in their corrective action plans are was due to a procedural error. The provider chose to wait for LEA response before holding the Transition meeting, rather than holding the meeting with the family according to procedural expectations.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

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

8C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8C - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

8C - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

No Data to Report

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

10 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

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

NO

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The RI Executive Office of Health and Human Services (EOHHS) conducted presentations to provide information to and gather input from stakeholders related to RI's State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Reports, current and historical data and targets for both compliance and improvement indicators, and previous and ongoing strategies for improvement. These presentations and materials were used with the state's administrative team, the state's ICC, and the state's EI Director's group. Each of these groups were given the opportunity to make suggestions for new targets through FFY2018 and provide ideas for new or continued improvement strategies. The input from these presentations was compiled and utilized to set the new targets which was then reported back to each of the stakeholder groups for final review and comment. All of the groups agreed to the final targets.

For FFY 2019 target setting, a similar stakeholder involvement process was used with stakeholders from the state's ICC and EI Directors group. In addition to the process already described, the groups reviewed historical data and past targets, to suggest new targets. Targets from all groups were averaged for a final target which was approved by the state's ICC.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005				
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target>=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2018. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

10 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role

Lead Agency Director

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Jennifer Kaufman

Title:

Part C Coordinator

Email:

jennifer.kaufman@ohhs.ri.gov

Phone:

4014623425

Submitted on:

04/28/20 9:30:09 AM