Essential Elements

|  |
| --- |
| Indicator Description:  |
| Percent of infants and toddlers with Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. |
| Measurement:[[1]](#footnote-2)  |
| Percent = [(number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by (total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.Account for untimely receipt of services, including the reasons for delays. |
| Target Setting: This is a compliance indicator. |
| Target must be 100 percent. |
| [GRADS360°](https://osep.grads360.org/#program) Reporting Information: Describe log-in information, location of manual, etc.  |
|  |
| Data Stewards: Provide titles and names, contact information, department, and any notes on persons responsible for collections, validation, analysis, and submission. If there are multiple parties responsible or involved in the process, list them all (i.e., Part C coordinator, Part C data manager, program coordinator, provider, etc.). |
|  |
| Data Source Description: Provide a short description of the databases or systems your state uses to gather data for this indicator.  |
| If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select early intervention service (EIS) programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period. |
|  |
| State Collection and Submission Schedule: Provide a list of dates necessary for this data collection, including when the data collection period opens, when data are due from the local early intervention service (EIS) programs, and when assigned staff pull the data after the collection closes. |
|  |

Processes

|  |
| --- |
| Collection: Provide detailed information about the origin and collection of the data and names and titles of persons responsible. (If data are from state monitoring, describe the method your state uses to select EI programs that it monitored.) |
| The State’s timeliness measure for this indicator must be either: (1) a time period that runs from when the parent consents to IFSP services; or (2) the IFSP initiation date (established by the IFSP Team, including the parent). |
|  |
| Data Validation: Describe the data cleaning processes and any other processes your state uses to ensure high-quality data. |
|  |
| Data Analysis:[[2]](#footnote-3) Describe the process for data analysis. |
| Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. States report in both the numerator and denominator under Indicator 1 on the number of children for whom the State ensured the timely initiation of new services identified on the IFSP. Include the timely initiation of new early intervention services from both initial IFSPs and subsequent IFSPs. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child’s record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances. |
|  |
| Response to OSEP-Required Actions: Describe the procedures for reviewing Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) feedback. Following the release of the OSEP determination, indicate who reviews OSEP feedback and how assigned staff make the plan to address concerns and create a response. |
|  |
| Report on Correction of Identified Noncompliance: Decribe the databases, sources, and persons responsible for conducting the verification of correction reported in the previous State Performance Plan Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR).  |
| If the state reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2015), and the state did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the state did not identify any findings of noncompliance. |
|  |
| **Internal Approval Process:** Describe any internal approval processes (e.g., who must sign off and timelines). |
|  |
| External Approval Process: Describe the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) certification process. Include dates and timelines. |
|  |
| Submission: Describe process for entering the data and analyses into [GRADS360](https://osep.grads360.org/#program)o. Include information about the person authorized to certify the final report. |
|  |
| Clarification:[[3]](#footnote-4) Describe the process your state uses to prepare a response to OSEP’s request for clarification.  |
| Usually in March or April, OSEP provides notification. |
| Data Governance: Describe the process for reviewing and approving potential or actual future changes to the data collection and associated requirements.  |
|  |
| Public Reporting: Describe the process and format for publicly reporting the performance of each local EIS program against the target of the state’s SPP/APR data. Note where your state posts the state and local SPP/APR data.  |
|  |

1. **Measurement:** Part C Indicator Measurement Table 2018, for FFY 2016 submission. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. **Data Analysis:** Review data year to year, looking for patterns statewide and within local EIS programs, outliers, whether targets are met or not met, and slippage. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. **Clarification:** OSEP generally sends clarification requests to states about 60 days post-submission. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)