Essential Elements

|  |
| --- |
| Indicator Description:  |
| Percent of infants and toddlers with Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs) who demonstrate improved3A. positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);3B. acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and 3C. use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. |
| Measurement:[[1]](#footnote-2) |
| Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes: Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program. Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in category (d) divided by [# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d)] times 100. Summary Statement 2: The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program. **Measurement for Summary Statement 2:** Percent = # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus [# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e) divided by the total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.  |
| **Progress Categories for Outcomes A, B, and C:** a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100. b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100. c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100. d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100. In the measurement, include in the numerator and denominator only infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program. |
|  |
| Target Setting: This is a results indicator. Describe the process your state uses to engage stakeholders and set targets. |
|  |
| [GRADS360°](https://osep.grads360.org/#program) Reporting Information: Describe log-in information, location of manual, etc. |
|  |
| Data Stewards: Provide titles and names, contact information, departments, and any notes on persons responsible for collections, validation, 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 data systems your state uses to process data for this indicator.  |
|  |
| 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 early intervention service (EIS) programs that it monitors.) |
| Sampling of infants and toddlers with IFSPs is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the state is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS). If the state’s Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays, the state must report data in two ways. First, it must report on all eligible children but exclude its at-risk infants and toddlers or having a diagnosed physical or mental condition that has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay. Second, the state must separately report outcome data on either: (1) just its at-risk infants and toddlers; or (2) aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C.  |
|  |
| 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.  |
| In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.” If a state is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.Report: (1) the number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State’s Part C exiting data under Section 618 of the IDEA; and (2) the number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program. States have the option to report, with the FFY 2016 SPP/APR due February 2018, the data on the number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program. States must report this data starting with the FFY 2017 SPP/APR submission, due February 2019.  |
|  |
| 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. |
|  |
| 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 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 your state’s State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) data. Note where your state posts the Lead Agency and local EIS program SPP/APR data. |
|  |

1. **Measurement:** Part C Indicator Measurement Table 2017, for FFY 2015 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)