

CA Part C

FFY2013 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

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

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.

California monitors the implementation of Part C Early Intervention Services provided in California through the Early Start programs at regional centers (RCs) and local educational agencies (LEAs). The primary focus of State monitoring activities is on improving results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities, and ensuring that local programs meet all Part C requirements.

The Department of Developmental Services (DDS) monitors RCs using quantifiable indicators in each of the priority areas specified by the Office of Special Programs (OSEP). DDS conducts on-site program monitoring on a three year cycle. DDS reviews a random selection of records during the Part C on-site review.

Compliance monitoring for the Early Start programs at the local educational agencies (LEAs) is addressed by the California Department of Education's (CDE) Special Education Division's Quality Assurance Process (QAP). The QAP addresses noncompliance and timelines for corrective actions.

Through subsequent reviews, DDS and CDE verify the correction of noncompliance on all findings on both the individual and systemic level within a year of notification to the RC or LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

As part of the General Supervision requirements, California's dispute resolution process is available to address disagreements between parents and the service system. At any time, parents have the right to request a due process hearing, a mediation conference, or file a state complaint to resolve disagreements related to Early Start services or allegations that a federal or state statute or regulation has been violated. The court appointed administrative law judge or complaint investigator may identify noncompliance during an investigation or hearing. If noncompliance has been identified, DDS and CDE verify the correction of findings derived from the dispute resolution process to ensure that decisions rendered are implemented at the local level through the RCs or LEAs.

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 State identifies the need for technical assistance (TA) through on-going monitoring activities, results of dispute resolution activities, and regular review of information contained in data collection systems. These methods allow for the provision of targeted and/or statewide assistance as needed. Technical assistance is provided in a variety of ways and may include State and/or WestEd staff in the delivery of assistance.

TA is also available upon request. Additionally, on-going assistance is provided on various topics (e.g. specific TA was made available during FFY 2013 for Indicator 3 (Child Outcomes)).

Additionally, DDS provides TA on topics relevant to Early Start by regularly attending the regional Early Start supervisor meetings and the Association of Regional Center Agencies Early Start Discipline Group. Staff also provides TA during the monitoring process by assisting local programs with identifying the root cause of noncompliance and the required follow up activities.

California regularly provides TA on Early Start program requirements to the University of California Center for Excellence on Developmental Disabilities' California Early Start Support Network. This group is comprised of Early Intervention Service providers, including local educational agencies, and early childhood personnel from DDS and CDE.

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 Early Start Training and Technical Assistance (ES TTA) Development Leadership Group, comprised of DDS, CDE, and WestEd staff, convened regularly to address on-going development and implementation of the multi-modal personnel development system. Components of the Early Start Personnel Development Systems include:

Early Start Online: Web-based, interactive training modules that address foundational and advanced knowledge-level

content.

Ongoing facilitation by parent-professional teams expanded the expertise and perspectives available to online training participants, maintained participant satisfaction with training experiences, and supported participant course completion.

Pre- and post-training assessments continued to validate increases in knowledge levels for training participants.

Participation in and feedback on Early Start Online remained high,

Impact survey results continued to validate integration of increased knowledge into work at the individual level for Early Start Online participants.

Early Start Online currently consists of two course series: Foundations and Skill Base. This year, one new Skill Base course was offered: Facilitating Sensory Processing Development. The full Early Start Online Foundations Series, consisting of three Foundations courses, includes:

- Foundations I: Understanding Systems, Processes and Practices
 - o Family Systems
 - o Early Start System
 - o Utilizing Evidence-Based Practice
 - o IFSP Development Supporting Families Using Coaching and Other Help--Giving Practices
- Foundations II: Working through the IFSP Process
 - o Early Child Development Screening, Evaluation, and Assessment
 - o Creating Functional Outcomes
 - o Natural Environments for Families
 - o Selecting and Developing Interventions
- Foundations III: Partnering for Effective Service Delivery
 - o Working with Diverse Families
 - o Relationship--Based Early Intervention
 - o Quality Assurance in Early Intervention
 - o Transition Planning
 - o Collaboration with the Early Start Team and Community Resources

The Early Start Skill Base Series includes courses that address development and intervention within specific developmental domains or disability conditions. Each Skill Base course includes five lessons addressing similar content areas but with a focus on a specific domain. Two Skill Base courses, on sensory processing and social/emotional development, have been fully produced and implemented. Development of a third Skill Base course on communication development is underway. Skill Base lessons include:

- o Developmental Milestones
- o Red Flags, Common Disabilities, and Referrals
- o Essentials of Assessment
- o Outcomes, Services, and Coordination

o Intervention Strategies to Work with Children and Their Families

The roles reported most frequently by participants who completed the courses this fiscal year were early intervention direct service providers and Early Start service coordinators.

Early Start Neighborhood: Through its contract with West Ed, DDS provides a forum for job-alike or special topic facilitated, monitored interactive groups to extend the expert and peer-support initiated online activities.

Stakeholder Involvement:

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

Input on the targets included in this SPP was provided by the State's broad and diverse Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) which includes parents, professionals providing services to infants and toddlers as well as State departments involved in the provision of services for infants and toddlers. In California, the ICC also benefits from the participation of community representatives, which increases the diversity of perspectives presented. Additionally, input on performance targets was received from the State's Task Force established to guide the development of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The SSIP Task Force includes representatives of the ICC as well as additional parents, service professionals, local early intervention programs, case management representatives and others.

Reporting to the Public:

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

As required by 34 CFR, §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A), the State of California will post the performance of local programs in relation to the targets in the SPP/APR of each Early Intervention Program Program DDS website at http://www.dds.ca.gov/EarlyStart/RM_LocalPerformance.cfm. The State's SPP is available at http://www.dds.ca.gov/EarlyStart/docs/PartCStatePerformancePlan_Feb2011.pdf.

OSEP Response

The State has not publicly reported on the FFY 2012 (July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013) performance of each EIS program located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA, specifically the State has not included this information on its Web site. The State of California must post the performance of local EIS programs in relation to the targets in the SPP/APR no later than 120 days following APR submission and inform OSEP when and where the State has posted this report.

OSEP's 2014 California Part C Determination Letter and FFY 2012 APR Response Table required that, as part of California's 2014 "needs intervention" determination for four consecutive years, the State was required to submit a corrective action plan (CAP) by September 2, 2014 with specific steps and timelines: (1) to ensure that it would provide valid and reliable FFY 2013 data for both Indicators 8B and 8C in its FFY 2013 SPP/APR; and (2) to revise, update and submit to OSEP, its transition policies and a transition agreement to reflect the requirements of 34 CFR 303.209. The CAP required the State to submit an initial progress report by December 1, 2014 and a final progress report by February 2, 2015. OSEP's response to these required submissions is reflected in Indicators 8B and 8C.

Required Actions

[Empty box for Required Actions]

Indicator 1: Timely provision of services

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	91.50%	94.60%	94.70%	96.73%	95.00%	NVR	90.30%	87.70%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	34,759	635

Explanation of Alternate Data

The data for this indicator comes from California's monitoring system.

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
null		87.70%	100%	85.04%

Explanation of Slippage

FFY 2013 data indicate that 85.04 percent (540 divided by 635, times 100 equals 85.04) of infants and toddlers with Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs) received the Early Intervention Services (EIS) on their IFSP in a timely manner. This figure represents slippage from FFY 2012 of 2.66 percent.

California continues to work toward achieving the measurable and rigorous target of 100 percent for this indicator.

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)

6

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

- State monitoring
- State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

The Department of Developmental Services (DDS) conducts on-site reviews of a cohort of RC Early Start programs each year as part of a three-year monitoring cycle. DDS conducted seven on-site reviews during FFY 2013. The sample of records reviewed is random and based on the population served. The California Department of Education (CDE) data is derived from monitoring for infants and toddlers served with solely low incidence disabilities in FFY 2013.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
17	15	null	2

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

In order to verify the correction of noncompliance, California confirms that the identified EIS were provided, although late for any child whose services did not occur in a timely manner, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the early intervention system, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In addition, California ensures that each agency with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a subsequent review of records as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from identification of noncompliance.

Findings identified by DDS

In addition to the above, with the exception of those findings cleared prior to the issuance of the report, DDS notifies the RC, in writing, of the noncompliance. A root cause analysis is completed by the RC, with assistance from DDS, to determine the actions necessary to ensure compliance. These actions are documented in a plan of correction and submitted to DDS. DDS ensures that each agency with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a subsequent verification review as soon as possible.

Seven of the seventeen findings identified in FFY 2012 were identified at RCs by DDS. DDS completed a verification review at the RCs with outstanding findings from FFY 2012. DDS verified that five of the seven RCs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1).

Findings identified by CDE

CDE requires a more stringent level of follow-up review and reporting in districts with previously corrected noncompliance related to this indicator. The additional reporting ensures that LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements by reviewing policies, procedures and practices, providing staff training, and by reviewing a new sample of student records for each district-level finding. District level corrective actions are given a timeline of three months. For all

FFY 2013 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

findings, correction must be completed as soon as possible but, in no case later than one year.

CDE issued the remaining 10 findings identified on this indicator that were verified as corrected within the required timeline. CDE has verified that each Local Educational Agency (LEA) with noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR, §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1).

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

For each individual findings identified, DDS or CDE confirmed that all EIS were provided, although late for all children whose services did not occur in a timely manner, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program.

FFY 2012 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The two remaining findings identified at RCs for FFY 2012 were unable to be verified as corrected. DDS continues to provide technical assistance to both RCs to address this item as soon as possible.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2013, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2014 APR, that the remaining two uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2014 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 and each EIS program or provider with remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012: (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 2014 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		76.30%	79.70%	83.20%	86.60%	90.00%	77.00%	83.00%
Data	72.09%	86.33%	85.89%	86.28%	87.70%	85.00%	87.30%	75.30%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	86.41%	86.41%	87.00%	87.50%	88.00%	88.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State Performance Plan (SPP) targets for all indicators were presented to the Interagency Coordinating Council on Early Intervention (ICC) in January 2015, for discussion and input. Additionally, in FFY 2013, the ICC added reporting by the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) on the Annual Performance Report (APR) as a standing item to the ICC agenda. The State reviews the APR from the prior FFY at the first ICC meeting each year. Throughout the year, the State brings information regarding program legislation, regulations, any new guidance from the Office of Special Education Programs, and requests for input to the ICC.

To establish targets for FFY 2013 – 2018, the State began by calculating the average results from FFY 2006 through FFY 2013, excluding the highest and lowest results. This calculated average of 86.41% was used as the target for both FFY 2013 and FFY 2014 with targeted increases in the following years.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	32,534	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	34,759	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data

FFY 2013 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

community-based settings				
32,534	34,759	75.30%	86.41%	93.60%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

-

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A1	2013	Target ≥					39.30%	39.80%	39.80%	39.80%
		Data				38.80%	46.90%	NVR	45.40%	43.30%
A2	2013	Target ≥					76.90%	77.00%	77.00%	77.00%
		Data				76.40%	72.50%	NVR	66.00%	64.30%
B1	2013	Target ≥					42.90%	43.40%	43.00%	43.00%
		Data				42.40%	43.90%	NVR	49.00%	49.50%
B2	2013	Target ≥					68.50%	69.00%	69.00%	69.00%
		Data				68.00%	64.20%	NVR	51.80%	50.70%
C1	2013	Target ≥					33.70%	34.02%	34.00%	34.00%
		Data				33.20%	41.40%	NVR	39.40%	37.80%
C2	2013	Target ≥					71.50%	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%
		Data				71.00%	67.80%	NVR	61.30%	60.60%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	44.32%	44.32%	44.32%	45.00%	47.00%	49.00%
Target A2 ≥	65.88%	65.88%	65.88%	66.00%	66.50%	67.00%
Target B1 ≥	49.53%	49.53%	49.53%	50.00%	50.50%	51.00%
Target B2 ≥	52.23%	52.23%	52.23%	53.00%	53.50%	54.00%
Target C1 ≥	37.85%	37.85%	37.85%	38.50%	39.00%	39.50%
Target C2 ≥	61.83%	61.83%	61.83%	62.00%	62.50%	63.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State Performance Plan (SPP) targets for all indicators were presented to the Interagency Coordinating Council on Early Intervention (ICC) in January 2015, for discussion and input. Additionally, in FFY 2013, the ICC added reporting by the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) on the Annual Performance Report (APR) as a standing item to the ICC agenda. The State reviews the APR from the prior FFY at the first ICC meeting each year. Throughout the year, the State brings information regarding program legislation, regulations, any new guidance from the Office of Special Education Programs, and requests for input to the ICC.

Additionally, data and information regarding child outcomes were reviewed by the State's Task Force established to guide the development of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The SSIP Task Force ultimately decided to focus on measure A1 as the State-identified Measureable Result (SIMR).

FFY 2013 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Targets for FFY 2013 were based on actual FFY 2013 baseline data. Targets remain static for the initial three years and increase each year thereafter. Target A1 (SiMR) was raised by two percentage points in FFY 2017 and FFY 2018 in accordance with stakeholder approved rigorous targets.

Because extensive improvement strategies will be implemented in the outcomes area, it is also expected that gains will be made in the other Child Outcome areas. To this end, California has increased targets accordingly, with all other outcome areas reflecting anticipated improvement of about two percentage points.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	48,722
--	--------

Does 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)? No

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

	Number of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	1,221
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	4,210
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	448
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,875
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	7,477

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	4,323	9,754	43.30%	44.32%	44.32%
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	11,352	17,231	64.30%	65.88%	65.88%

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

	Number of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	493
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	6,674
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,064
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	5,970
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,030

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the	7,034	14,201	49.50%	49.53%	49.53%

FFY 2013 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).					
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	9,000	17,231	50.70%	52.23%	52.23%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	1,036
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	5,219
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	322
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,487
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	7,167

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	3,809	10,064	37.80%	37.85%	37.85%
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	10,654	17,231	60.60%	61.83%	61.83%

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

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

Consistent with Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) criteria, only children in the program for a minimum of six months were included in the sample for child outcomes. For purposes of data reporting for this APR, data for children with solely low incidence disabilities served by CDE was collected through a random sampling of children who exited Part C in FFY 2013. Data for all children served by Regional Centers who met the OSEP criteria for this indicator was gathered through the Early Start Report (ESR). The electronic ESR template includes all of the OSEP required data elements for child outcomes, as well as diagnostic information in the areas of developmental disabilities, developmental delays, and established risk areas. The child outcomes fields include the recording of functional ages in seven performance categories (physical development including fine and gross motor, social/emotional, expressive and receptive language, cognitive, and self-help adaptive/use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs). The child outcomes data reports generated by the ESR data are programmed to utilize children's data with completed functional ages in all domain areas for entry and exit.

The child outcome records that meet the criteria used in Indicator 3 represents 67 percent of the children that exited Early Start during this reporting year, and either completed Part C services, or exited at three years old.

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? No

Provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" and list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Children were considered comparable to same-aged peers if their functional age in a given developmental domain was within

33 percent of their chronological age.

Beyond the use of standard evaluation tools specific to each licensed professional, informed clinical judgment was one of several key principles employed for determining functional levels and, therefore, child progress/outcomes. RC and contracted clinicians also used: (1) formal assessment techniques and instruments; (2) direct informal observations of the child; (3) review of all pertinent records; and, (4) parent/caregiver interview or discussion.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 APR.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

California used FFY2013 data as "baseline" data. As a result, targets were met in all three Outcome Areas for Summary Statement #1 and Summary Statement #2.

Summary Statement 1:

Area A – Target 44.32%, Actual 44.32% This represents an increase (progress) of 1.02% over FFY2012 data (43.30%).

Area B - Target 49.53%, Actual 49.53% This represents no change from FFY2012 data (49.50%).

Area C - Target 37.85%, Actual 37.85% This represents no change from FFY2012 data (37.80%).

Summary Statement 2:

Area A - Target 65.88%, Actual 65.88% This represents an increase (progress) of 1.58% over FFY2012 data (64.30%).

Area B - Target 52.23%, Actual 52.23% This represents an increase (progress) of 1.53% over FFY2012 data (50.70%).

Area C - Target 61.83%, Actual 61.83% This represents an increase (progress) of .29% over FFY2012 data (60.60%).

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2005	Target ≥				49.50%	50.00%	50.50%	50.50%	51.50%
		Data	48.00%			80.10%	79.60%	83.00%	82.00%	77.20%
B	2005	Target ≥				43.50%	44.00%	44.50%	44.50%	45.50%
		Data	42.00%			88.70%	88.60%	87.50%	89.00%	81.80%
C	2005	Target ≥				72.50%	73.00%	73.50%	73.70%	75.70%
		Data	71.00%			91.30%	90.50%	91.20%	92.00%	79.20%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%
Target B ≥	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Target C ≥	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State Performance Plan (SPP) targets for all indicators were presented to the Interagency Coordinating Council on Early Intervention (ICC) in January 2015, for discussion and input. Additionally, in FFY 2013, the ICC added reporting by the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) on the Annual Performance Report (APR) as a standing item to the ICC agenda. The State reviews the APR from the prior FFY at the first ICC meeting each year. Throughout the year, the State brings information regarding program legislation, regulations, any new guidance from the Office of Special Education Programs, and requests for input to the ICC.

At the January ICC meeting DDS shared the data with the ICC and presented that California met the measurable and rigorous targets for each target area within this indicator.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent families participating in Part C	1,157
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	866
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	1,149
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	932
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	1,148

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	880
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	1,148

	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	77.20%	70.00%	75.37%
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	81.80%	80.00%	81.18%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	79.20%	75.00%	76.66%

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

California continues to employ an adapted version of the *Family Outcomes Survey* (FOS Revised Part C, 2010)^[1] to gather and analyze Indicator 4 data for FFY 2013. The survey includes seventeen questions and allows the State to compile accurate data with regard to early intervention services. The questions were designed to be easy to understand, and are aligned with Indicator 4 sub-indicators, A, B, and C. The systematic sampling procedure was calculated using a confidence level of 90 percent and an estimated response rate of 20.3 percent to achieve significance.

DDS employed Dillman's Tailored Design Method (2009)^[2] for the most recent survey distribution and collection. Packets were mailed to families in April 2014 and included cover letters, surveys in English and Spanish, and a self-addressed return envelope. A total of 1,157 valid surveys were returned, yielding an overall response rate of 20.6 percent. Descriptive statistics (means, frequencies, percentages and standard deviations) were employed to analyze the responses to the seventeen Indicator 4 survey items within the three target areas.

When delineated by ethnicity, results indicated that the Asian, Hispanic, White, and 'Declined to State' subgroups achieved the response rates needed to indicate a representative sample. Only the Native American and African American subgroups did not achieve the response rates needed to fully represent these families in our State.

[1] Bailey, D.B., Hebbler, K., & Bruder, M.B. (2006). *Family Outcomes Survey*. Retrieved October 18, 2009 from, <http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~eco/pages/tools.cfm#SurveyVersions..>

[2] Dillman, D., Smythe, J., & Christian, M. (2009). *Internet, Mail and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State

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

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

DDS drew a random sample of families of children served by Regional Centers (RC)s, representative of the total population (approximately 30,000 families) of California's Early Start families whose children were currently receiving services from local programs, and had been in the program for at least six months, at a specific point in time (February 2014). These selection criteria yielded a sample of approximately 14,000 families. DDS used systematic sampling procedures to stratify a random

sample of 5,612 families proportionally drawn from the sample across five ethnicity groups (Asian, African American, Hispanic, Native American, and White) and Declined to State.

The seventeen questions were measured on a 5-point Likert scale (1= Poor to 5= Excellent). Families were asked to read each question and circle the number that *best describes your family right now*. Raspa, Hebbler, and Bailey (2009)^[1] recommend using a cutoff point of 4 (Good) and calculating the percentage of responses that are 4 (good) and higher for Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) data reporting purposes. Analyses of response data indicate that California met its 2013 Indicator 4 target for each of the three sub-indicators.

[1] Raspa, M., Hebbler, K., & Bailey, D.B., (2009). *A guide to analyzing the data from the Family Outcomes Survey*. Menlo Park, CA: Early Childhood Outcomes Center.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		0.95%	0.95%	0.95%	0.95%	0.96%	0.96%	0.98%
Data	1.14%	1.15%	1.26%	1.12%	0.98%	0.65%	0.72%	0.77%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	0.79%	0.80%	0.81%	0.82%	0.83%	0.84%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State Performance Plan (SPP) targets for all indicators were presented to the Interagency Coordinating Council on Early Intervention (ICC) in January 2015, for discussion and input. Additionally, in FFY 2013, the ICC added reporting by the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) on the Annual Performance Report (APR) as a standing item to the ICC agenda. The State reviews the APR from the prior FFY at the first ICC meeting each year. Throughout the year, the State brings information regarding program legislation, regulations, any new guidance from the Office of Special Education Programs, and requests for input to the ICC.

FFY 2013 data indicate that .79 percent (3,939 divided by 500,877 times 100) of infants, ages birth to 1, were served. This figure meets the State’s measurable and rigorous target and is .27 percent below the national average of 1.06 percent.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	3,939	null
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013	12/16/2014	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	500,877	null

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
3,939	500,877	0.77%	0.79%	0.79%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets

Required Actions

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		1.80%	1.85%	0.95%	1.95%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Data	1.99%	2.11%	2.37%	1.12%	2.29%	2.04%	2.20%	2.20%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	2.20%	2.20%	2.20%	2.20%	2.20%	2.20%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State Performance Plan (SPP) targets for all indicators were presented to the Interagency Coordinating Council on Early Intervention (ICC) in January 2015, for discussion and input. Additionally, in FFY 2013, the ICC added reporting by the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) on the Annual Performance Report (APR) as a standing item to the ICC agenda. The State reviews the APR from the prior FFY at the first ICC meeting each year. Throughout the year, the State brings information regarding program legislation, regulations, any new guidance from the Office of Special Education Programs, and requests for input to the ICC.

California met the measurable and rigorous targets within this indicator. Since California continues to exceed its targets for this indicator, they have been adjusted to more accurately reflect this high level of performance.

California exceeded the measurable and rigorous target for this indicator. FFY 2013 data indicate that 2.3 percent (34,759 divided by 1,508,686, times 100 equals 2.3) of infants and toddlers in California have IFSPs, ages birth to three years old. This figure is .47 percent below the national average of 2.77 percent. This figure represents an improvement of .1 percent from FFY 2012 (2.3 - 2.2 equals .1).

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	34,759	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013	12/16/2014	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	1,508,686	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data

FFY 2013 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
34,759	1,508,686	2.20%	2.20%	2.30%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	90.43%	90.28%	90.43%	75.97%	70.30%	NVR	84.00%	91.30%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
529	635	91.30%	100%	86.14%

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)	18
--	----

Explanation of Slippage

FFY 2013 data indicate that 86.14 percent of infants and toddlers had an evaluation and assessment completed and an initial Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) meeting held within 45 days of referral (547 divided by 635, times 100 equals 86.14 percent). This figure represents slippage of 5.16 percent from FFY 2012.

California continues to work toward achieving the measurable and rigorous target of 100 percent for this indicator.

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

- State monitoring
- State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

DDS conducts on-site reviews of a cohort of Regional Centers (RC) Early Start programs each year as part of a three-year

monitoring cycle. The Department of Developmental Services (DDS) conducted seven on-site reviews during FFY 2013. The sample of records reviewed is random and based on the population served. The California Department of Education (CDE) data is derived from monitoring for infants and toddlers served with solely low incidence disabilities in FFY 2013.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
32	31	null	1

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

In order to verify the correction of noncompliance, California confirms that the IFSP meeting was held, although late for any child whose IFSP meeting did not occur in a timely manner, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In addition, California ensures that each agency with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a subsequent review of records as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification of noncompliance.

Findings identified by DDS

In addition to the above, with the exception of those findings cleared prior to the issuance of the report, DDS notifies the RC, in writing, of the noncompliance. A root cause analysis is completed by the RC, with assistance from DDS, to determine the actions necessary to ensure compliance. These actions are documented in a plan of correction and submitted to DDS. DDS ensures that each agency with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a subsequent verification review as soon as possible.

Five of the thirty-two findings identified in FFY 2012 were identified at RCs by DDS. DDS completed a verification review at the RCs with outstanding findings from FFY 2012. DDS verified that four of the five RCs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), §§303.321 and 303.342.

Findings identified by CDE

CDE requires a more stringent level of follow-up review and reporting in districts with previously corrected noncompliance related to this indicator. The additional reporting ensures that LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements by reviewing policies, procedures and practices, providing staff training, and by reviewing a new sample of student records for each district-level finding. District level corrective actions are given a timeline of three months. For all findings, correction must be completed as soon as possible but, in no case later than one year.

CDE issued the remaining 27 findings identified on this indicator that were verified as corrected within the required timeline. CDE has verified that each Local Educational Agency (LEA) with noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR, §§303.321 and 303.342.

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

For each individual finding identified, DDS or CDE confirmed that the IFSP was completed, although late for all children whose IFSP did not occur in a timely manner, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program.

FFY 2012 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The remaining finding identified at a RC for FFY 2012 was unable to be verified as corrected. DDS will continue to provide technical assistance to this RC to address this item as soon as possible.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2013, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2014 APR, that the remaining uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 was corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2014 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 and the EIS program or provider with the remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012: (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 2014 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	85.71%	90.00%	92.38%	91.40%	NVR	NVR	NVR	82.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

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

- Yes
- No

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
217	293	82.00%	100%	74.06%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services)	0
---	---

Explanation of Slippage

FFY 2013 data indicate 74.06 percent of the children exiting Part C have an Individualized Family Service Plan (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 (217 divided by 293 times 100 equals 74.06 percent). This figure represents slippage from FFY 2013 of 7.94 percent.

It should be noted that almost all of the records reviewed contained IFSPs with transition plans. California is confident that discussions regarding individualized transition needs are occurring during the transition conference. However, the individualized steps and services are not always well documented. California continues to work with our local programs to ensure that the standard is met on this indicator.

The Department of Developmental Services (DDS) and the California Department of Education (CDE) have dedicated resources to improving performance on this indicator. The following are collaborative activities by DDS and CDE to improve transition from Part C to Part B:

Local Trainings

Since February 2012, DDS and CDE have conducted trainings with all 21 Regional Centers (RC) and their respective Local Educational Agencies (LEA), and Special Education partners. The joint trainings focused on conducting the transition meetings, preparing families for transition, interagency communication and notification, developing and implementing transition steps, defining agency responsibilities and facilitating dialogue between Part C and B personnel. The trainings were completed in all areas at the end of FFY 2013. With the completion of the trainings statewide, California is optimistic that local programs will improve performance on the transition indicators.

Transition Guide

DDS and CDE published a joint transition handbook, *Effective Early Childhood Transitions-A Guide for Transition at Age Three- Early Start to Preschool*. This guide provides the tools for IFSP team members to provide a smooth process for the families transitioning from Part C to Part B. CDE and DDS will continue to direct local programs to access the guide to achieve smooth transitions for the families exiting Part C and to improve performance on the compliance requirements.

Training Modules

DDS, CDE, and the WestEd Center for Prevention and Early Intervention have developed, and are offering a series of on-line interactive courses for intervention personnel who serve Early Start children and families. Transition planning is part of the Foundations Series.

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

- State monitoring
- State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

DDS conducts on-site reviews of a cohort of RC Early Start programs each year as part of a three-year monitoring cycle. DDS conducted seven on-site reviews during FFY 2013. The sample of records reviewed is random and based on the population served. The California Department of Education (CDE) data is derived from monitoring for infants and toddlers with solely low incidence disabilities in FFY 2013.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
12	8	0	4

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

In order to verify the correction of noncompliance, California gathers data to verify corrections through a review of subsequent records. California confirms that transition steps and services were completed, although late, for any child whose transition did not occur in a timely manner, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In addition, California ensures that each agency with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a subsequent review of records as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification of noncompliance.

Findings identified by DDS

In addition to the above, with the exception of those findings cleared prior to the issuance of the report, DDS notifies the RC, in writing, of the noncompliance. A root cause analysis is completed by the RC, with assistance from DDS, to determine the actions necessary to ensure compliance. These actions are documented in a plan of correction and submitted to DDS. DDS ensures that each agency with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a subsequent verification review as soon as possible.

Six of the twelve FFY 2012 findings for this indicator were identified by DDS at the RCs. DDS completed a verification review at the RCs with outstanding findings from FFY 2012. DDS verified that two of the six RCs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), §§ 303.209 and 303.344(h).

Findings identified by CDE

CDE requires a more stringent level of follow-up review and reporting in districts with previously corrected noncompliance related to this indicator. The additional reporting ensures that LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements by reviewing policies, procedures and practices, providing staff training, and by reviewing a new sample of student records for each district-level finding. District level corrective actions are given a timeline of three months. For all findings, correction must be completed as soon as possible but, in no case later than one year.

CDE issued the remaining six findings identified on this indicator that were verified as corrected within the required timeline. CDE has verified that each Local Educational Agency (LEA) with noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR, §§ 303.209 and 303.344(h).

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

For each individual finding identified, DDS or CDE confirmed that the transition steps and services were completed, although late, for any child whose transition did not occur in a timely manner, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program.

FFY 2012 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The four remaining findings identified at RCs for FFY 2012 were unable to be verified as corrected within one year. DDS will continue to provide technical assistance to these RC's to address this item as soon as possible.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2013, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2014 APR, that the remaining four uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2014 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013

FFY 2013 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

and each EIS program or provider with remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012: (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 2014 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	92.86%	100%	89.52%	87.36%	NVR	NVR	NVR	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

- Yes
- No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
190	293	0%	100%	64.85%

Number of parents who opted out (this number will be subtracted from the number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B when calculating the FFY 2013 Data)	0
---	---

Describe the method used to collect these data

Notification to the Local Educational Agency (LEA)

The Department of Developmental Services (DDS) conducts on-site reviews of a cohort of Regional Centers (RC) Early Start programs each year as part of a three-year monitoring cycle. DDS conducted seven on-site reviews during FFY 2013. The

sample of records reviewed is random and based on the population served. The California Department of Education (CDE) data is derived from monitoring for infants and toddlers served with solely low incidence disabilities in FFY 2013.

Notification to the State Educational Agency (SEA)

Each month DDS notifies CDE of children potentially eligible for Part B services at least 90 days prior to each child's third birthday.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? No

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

As part of California's 2014 "needs intervention" determination, the State must submit a CAP by September 2, 2014 to ensure that it provides valid and reliable data in its FFY 2013 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2015) for Indicator 8B reflecting compliance with the timely transition notification requirements of this indicator. Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2012, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2013 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 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 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Please see the CAP submitted by California for an update on the activities.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
13	8	null	5

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

In order to verify the correction of noncompliance, California gathers data to verify corrections through a review of subsequent records. California confirms that the LEA and SEA notification occurred, although late, for any child whose transition did not occur in a timely manner, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In addition, California ensures that each agency with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a subsequent review of records as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification of noncompliance.

Findings identified by DDS

In addition to the above, with the exception of those findings cleared prior to the issuance of the report, DDS notifies the RC, in writing, of the noncompliance. A root cause analysis is completed by the RC, with assistance from DDS, to determine the actions necessary to ensure compliance. These actions are documented in a plan of correction and submitted to DDS. DDS ensures that each agency with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a subsequent verification review as soon as possible.

Seven of the thirteen findings identified in FFY 2012 were identified at RCs by DDS. DDS completed a verification review at the RCs with outstanding findings from FFY 2012. DDS verified that two of the seven RCs are correctly implementing the specific regularly requirements in 34 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), §§ 303.209 and 303.344 (h).

Findings identified by CDE

FFY 2013 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

CDE requires a more stringent level of follow-up review and reporting in districts with previously corrected noncompliance related to this indicator. The additional reporting ensures that LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements by reviewing policies, procedures and practices, providing staff training, and by reviewing a new sample of student records for each district-level finding. District level corrective actions are given a timeline of three months. For all findings, correction must be completed as soon as possible but, in no case later than one year.

CDE issued the remaining 6 findings identified on this indicator that were verified as corrected within the required timeline. CDE has verified that each Local Educational Agency (LEA) with noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR, §§ 303.209 and 303.344(h).

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

For each individual finding identified, DDS or CDE confirmed that the notification to the LEA and SEA occurred, although late, for any child whose notification did not occur in a timely manner, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program.

FFY 2012 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The five remaining findings identified at RCs for FFY 2012 were unable to be verified as corrected within one year. DDS will continue to provide technical assistance to these RCs to address this item as soon as possible.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP's 2014 California Part C Determination Letter and FFY 2012 APR Response Table required that, as part of California's 2014 "needs intervention" determination for four consecutive years, the State was required to submit a corrective action plan (CAP) by September 2, 2014 with specific steps and timelines: (1) to ensure that it would provide valid and reliable FFY 2013 data for both Indicators 8B and 8C in its FFY 2013 SPP/APR; and (2) to revise, update and submit to OSEP, its transition policies and a transition agreement to reflect the requirements of 34 CFR 303.209. The CAP required the State to submit an initial progress report by December 1, 2014 and a final progress report by February 2, 2015. The State submitted its FFY 2013 data for Indicators 8B and 8C with its FFY 2013 SPP/APR and submitted a final progress report by May 29, 2015. In addition, the State submitted on December 15, 2014 its draft transition policies and on December 17, 2015 its draft transition agreement as proposed amendments to Section II.A.10 of its IDEA Part C FFY 2014 Grant. OSEP responded to the draft transition documents and will respond to the final transition policies and agreement with the State's FFY 2015 IDEA Part C grant.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2013, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2014 APR, that the remaining five uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2014 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 and each EIS program or provider with remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012: (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 2014 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	92.86%	100%	98.09%	96.55%	NVR	NVR	NVR	74.30%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

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

- Yes
- No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
206	293	74.30%	100%	72.01%

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference (this number will be subtracted from the number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B when calculating the FFY 2013 Data)	0
Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B)	5

Explanation of Slippage

FFY 2013 data indicate that the transition conference occurred for 72.01 percent of the children at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday (211 divided by 293 times 100 equals 72.01 percent). This final figure represents slippage from FFY 2012 of 2.29 percent.

Please see the Explanation of Slippage Section in Indicator 8A for details on the California strategies to address the compliance on this indicator.

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



State monitoring



State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

DDS conducts on-site reviews of a cohort of RC Early Start programs each year as part of a three-year monitoring cycle. DDS conducted seven on-site reviews during FFY 2013. The sample of records reviewed is random and based on the population served. The California Department of Education (CDE) data is derived from monitoring for infants and toddlers with solely low incidence disabilities in FFY 2013.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

As part of California's 2014 "needs intervention" determination, the State must submit a corrective action plan by September 2, 2014 to ensure that it provides valid and reliable data in its FFY 2013 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2015) for Indicator 8C reflecting compliance with the timely transition conference requirements of this indicator. Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2012, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2013 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 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 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Please see the CAP submitted by California on February 2, 2015 for an update on the activities.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
13	9	null	4

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

In order to verify the correction of noncompliance, California confirms that the transition conference was held, although late, for any child whose transition conference did not occur in a timely manner, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In addition, California ensures that each agency with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a subsequent review of records as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification of noncompliance.

Findings identified by DDS

In addition to the above, with the exception of those findings cleared prior to the issuance of the report, DDS notifies the RC, in writing, of the noncompliance. A root cause analysis is completed by the RC, with assistance from DDS, to determine the actions necessary to ensure compliance. These actions are documented in a plan of correction and submitted to DDS. DDS ensures that each agency with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a subsequent verification review as soon as possible.

Seven of the thirteen findings identified in FFY 2012 were identified by DDS at the RCs. DDS completed a verification review at the RCs with outstanding findings from FFY 2012. DDS verified that three of the seven RCs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), §§ 303.209 and 303.344(h).

Findings identified by CDE

CDE requires a more stringent level of follow-up review and reporting in districts with previously corrected noncompliance related to this indicator. The additional reporting ensures that LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements by reviewing policies, procedures and practices, providing staff training, and by reviewing a new sample of student records for each district-level finding. District level corrective actions are given a timeline of three months. For all findings, correction must be completed as soon as possible but, in no case later than one year.

CDE issued the remaining 6 findings identified on this indicator that were verified as corrected within the required timeline. CDE has verified that each Local Educational Agency (LEA) with noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR, §§ 303.209 and 303.344(h).

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

For each individual finding identified, DDS or CDE confirmed that the transition conference was held, although late, for any child whose transition conference did not occur in a timely manner, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program.

FFY 2012 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The four remaining findings identified at RCs for FFY 2012 were unable to be verified as corrected within one year. DDS will continue to provide technical assistance to these RCs to address this item as soon as possible.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP's 2014 California Part C Determination Letter and FFY 2012 APR Response Table required that, as part of California's 2014 "needs intervention" determination for four consecutive years, the State was required to submit a corrective action plan (CAP) by September 2, 2014 with specific steps and timelines: (1) to ensure that it would provide valid and reliable FFY 2013 data for both Indicators 8B and 8C in its FFY 2013 SPP/APR; and (2) to revise, update and submit to OSEP, its transition policies and a transition agreement to reflect the requirements of 34 CFR 303.209. The CAP required the State to submit an initial progress report by December 1, 2014 and a final progress report by February 2, 2015. The State submitted its FFY 2013 data for Indicators 8B and 8C with its FFY 2013 SPP/APR and submitted a final progress report by May 29, 2015. In addition, the State submitted on December 15, 2014 its draft transition policies and on December 17, 2015 its draft transition agreement as proposed amendments to Section II.A.10 of its IDEA Part C FFY 2014 Grant. OSEP responded to the draft transition documents and will respond to the final transition policies and agreement with the State's FFY 2015 IDEA Part C grant.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2013, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2014 APR, that the remaining four uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012, were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2014 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 and each EIS program or provider with remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012: (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 2014 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data:

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥								
Data	0%							

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥						

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

N/A

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	null	null
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	null	null

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

3.1 Number of resolution sessions	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
null	null			

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

California is not using Part B due process hearing procedures. The State is not required to report on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2013 APR.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable to this State.

Required Actions

Indicator 10: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		55.00%	55.00%	100%	55.00%	55.00%	55.00%	55.00%
Data	55.00%	100%	100%	100%	100%	82.14%	90.91%	95.83%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State Performance Plan (SPP) targets for all indicators were presented to the Interagency Coordinating Council on Early Intervention (ICC) in January 2015, for discussion and input. Additionally, in FFY 2013, the ICC added reporting by the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) on the Annual Performance Report (APR) as a standing item to the ICC agenda. The State reviews the APR from the prior FFY at the first ICC meeting each year. Throughout the year, the State brings information regarding program legislation, regulations, any new guidance from the Office of Special Education Programs, and requests for input to the ICC.

California met the measurable and rigorous targets for this indicator. Data from FFY 2013 indicate that 88.24 percent of mediations held (8 plus 7 divided by 17, times 100 equals 88.24 percent) resulted in mediation agreements.

SPP Performance targets were set at the high level of performance in line with the consensus among mediation practitioners that 75-85% is a reasonable rate of mediations that result in agreements and is consistent with national mediation success rate data.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	8	null
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	7	null
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1 Mediations held	17	null

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

FFY 2013 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
8	7	17	95.83%	85.00%	88.24%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Baseline Data

FFY	2013
Data	44.32%

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	44.32%	44.32%	45.00%	47.00%	49.00%

Description of Measure

Please see attached PDF for a description of the measure.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please see attached PDF for a description of stakeholder input.

Data Analysis

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

Please see attached PDF for a description of the data analysis.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

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

Please see attached PDF for a description of the infrastructure analysis.

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

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

Statement

Increase the percentage of infants and toddlers with disabilities in California who will substantially increase their rate of growth in positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) by the time they exit the early intervention program.

Description

Please see attached PDF for a description of California's SiMR statement.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

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

Please see attached PDF for a list and explanation of California's improvement strategies.

Theory of Action

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

[California's Theory of Action \(SSIP/APR Indicator 11\)](#) California's Theory of Action (SSIP/APR Indicator 11)

Illustration

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

Please see attached PDF for a description of California's Theory of Action.

OSEP Response

[Empty text box for OSEP Response]

Required Actions

--

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

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

Selected: Designated by the Lead Agency Director to certify

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

Name: Jim Knight

Title: Assistant Deputy Director, CSD

Email: jim.knight@dds.ca.gov

Phone: 916-654-2300