State

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR)

Part C Indicator Measurement Table[1]

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments		
1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)	**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., time period from parent consent to IFSP services initiation date. **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.	*When data is taken from State monitoring, States must describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.* Targets must be 100%. Lead Agencies should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target when services are initiated according to the IFSP. The State should include in the calculation, children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record. The State must include in its discussion of the data, the numbers it used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to family circumstances.
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.[2] (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)	**Data Source:** Data collected for reporting under section 618 (Annual Report of Children Served). **Measurement:** Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.	*Sampling from State's 618 data is not allowed.* Lead Agencies should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target.

[1] Monitoring Priorities, indicators, and measurements included on the *Part C Indicator Measurement Table* are to be used to populate designated sections of the SPP and APR Templates. Populated templates can be found at http://www.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/capr/index.html

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)	**Data Source:** State selected data source. **Measurement:** A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships): 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	*Sampling **of infants and toddlers with IFSPs** is allowed. When sampling is used, a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates must be submitted to OSEP. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instruction on sampling.)* In presenting their results, States should provide their criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the ECO Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been scored as a 6 or 7 on the COSF. In addition, States should list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this Indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COSF. Lead Agencies should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100. If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference. B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy): a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# 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	

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100. e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100. If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference. C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs: a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100. b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100. c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.	

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100. e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100. If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference**.**	
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family: A. Know their rights; B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and C. Help their children develop and learn. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)	**Data Source:** State selected data source. State must clarify the data source in the State Performance Plan. **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	*Sampling of **families participating in Part C** is allowed. When sampling is used, a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates must be submitted to OSEP. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instruction on sampling.)* Lead Agencies should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target. States may wish to utilize information/surveys developed by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) or the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO). States must submit a copy of any survey used for this indicator.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.	
Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C		
Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find		
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to: A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and B. National data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)	**Data Source:** Data collected for reporting under section 618 (Annual Report of Children Served). **Measurement:** A. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to the same percent calculated for other States with similar (narrow, moderate or broad) eligibility definitions. B. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the **(**population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to National data.	*Sampling from State's 618 data is not allowed.* Lead Agencies should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target.
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to: A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and B. National data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)	**Data Source:** Data collected for reporting under section 618 (Annual Report of Children Served). **Measurement:** A. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to the same percent calculated for other States with similar (narrow, moderate or broad) eligibility definitions. B. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to	*Sampling from State's 618 data is not allowed.* Lead Agencies should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	National data.	
7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)	**Data Source:** Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must address 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 evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed)] times 100. Account for untimely evaluations.	*When data is taken from State monitoring, States must describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.* Targets must be 100%. The State should include in the calculation, children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record. The State must include in its discussion of data, the numbers it used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to family circumstances.
Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition		
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: A. IFSPs with transition steps and services; B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)	**Data Source:** Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system. **Measurement:** A. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C)] times 100. B. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100. C. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially	*When data is taken from State monitoring, States must describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.* Lead Agencies should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target. Targets must be 100%. Indicator 8C: The State should include in the calculation, children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record. The State should not include in the calculation children for whom the family did not provide approval to conduct the transition conference. The State must include in its discussion of data, the numbers it used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to family circumstances and the number of children for

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	eligible for Part B)] times 100.	whom the family did not provide approval to conduct the transition conference.
Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision		
9. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)	**Data Source:** Data to be taken from State monitoring, complaints, hearings and other general supervision system components. Indicate the number of EIS programs monitored using different components of the State's general supervision system. **Measurement:** Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification: a. # of findings of noncompliance. b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100. For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.	*Lead Agencies must describe the process for selecting EIS programs for monitoring.* Lead Agencies should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target. Targets must be 100%. States should reflect monitoring data collected through the components of the State's general supervision system, including on-site visits, self-assessments, local performance plans and annual performance reports, desk audits, data reviews, complaints, due process hearings, etc. Areas of noncompliance should be grouped by monitoring priority areas and other topical areas. The State should describe the topical areas. Lead Agencies are not required to report data at the EIS program level.
10. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)	**Data Source:** Data collected on Table 4 of Information Collection 1820-0678 (*Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*). **Measurement:** Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.	*Sampling is not allowed.* Lead Agencies should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target. Targets must be 100%. Lead Agencies are not required to report data at the EIS program level. Complete Table 4 of Information Collection 1820-0678 and submit copy of completed table with the FFY 2006 (2006-2007) APR due February 1, 2008. An electronic copy of Information Collection 1820-

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		0678 can be found at http://www.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/capr/index.html
11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)	**Data Source:** Data collected on Table 4 of Information Collection 1820-0678 (*Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*). **Measurement:** Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.	*Sampling is not allowed.* Lead Agencies should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target. Targets must be 100%. Lead Agencies are not required to report data at the EIS program level. Complete Table 4 of Information Collection 1820-0678 and submit copy of completed table with the FFY 2006 (2006-2007) APR due February 1, 2008. An electronic copy of Information Collection 1820-0678 can be found at http://www.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/capr/index.html
12. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)	**Data Source:** Data collected on Table 4 of Information Collection 1820-0678 (*Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*). **Measurement:** Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.	*Sampling is not allowed.* Lead Agencies are not required to report data at the EIS program level. 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 ten or greater, the State must develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report them in the corresponding APR. A target of 100% for this indicator may not be appropriate for all States. In looking at data on other forms of alternate dispute resolution, the consensus among practitioners is that 75-85% is a reasonable rate of mediations that result in agreements and is consistent with national mediation success rate data. However, a higher resolution session target may be appropriate for some States.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		Complete Table 4 of Information Collection 1820-0678 and submit copy of completed table with the FFY 2006 (2006-2007) APR due February 1, 2008. An electronic copy of Information Collection 1820-0678 can be found at http://www.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/capr/index.html
13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)	**Data Source:** Data collected on Table 4 of Information Collection 1820-0678 (*Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*). **Measurement:** Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.	*Sampling is not allowed.* Lead Agencies should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their 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 ten or greater, the State must develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report them in the corresponding APR. A target of 100% for this indicator may not be appropriate for all States. The consensus among mediation practitioners is that 75-85% is a reasonable rate of mediations that result in agreements and is consistent with national mediation success rate data. However, a higher mediation target may be appropriate for some States. Lead Agencies are not required to report data at the EIS program level. Complete Table 4 of Information Collection 1820-0678 and submit copy of completed table with the FFY 2006 (2006-2007) APR due February 1, 2008. An electronic copy of Information Collection 1820-0678 can be found at http://www.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/capr/index.html .
14. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual	**Data Source:** State selected data sources, including data from the	Lead Agencies should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
Performance Report) are timely and accurate. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)	State data system, as well as technical assistance and monitoring systems. **Measurement:** State reported data, including 618 data, State performance plan, and annual performance reports, are: a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, settings and November 1 for exiting, personnel, dispute resolution); and b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring error free, consistent, valid and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met).	Targets must be 100% for timeliness and accuracy. Lead Agencies are not required to report data at the EIS program level. To help determine if data are reported in an accurate manner, States are encouraged to reference *Data Accuracy: Critical Elements for Review of SPPs.* This document can be found at http://www.rrfcnetwork.org/content/view/248/358/