State

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

Part C Indicator Measurement Table[1]

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments		
1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)	**Data Source:** Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Include the State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services, i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated. **Measurement:** Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100. Account for untimely receipt of services, including the reasons for delays.	*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database,* describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period. 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. Include the timely initiation of new early intervention services from both initial IFSPs and subsequent IFSPs. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation. Targets must be 100%. The State's timeliness measure for this indicator must be either: (1) a time period that runs from when the parent consents to IFSP services; or (2) the IFSP initiation date (established by the IFSP Team, including the parent). States are not required to include in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to include in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		documented in the child's record, these numbers are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances. Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous APR. The State must demonstrate correction as set forth in OSEP's October 17, 2008 Letter to Dear Colleague and September 3, 2008 FAQs. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.), and any enforcement actions that were taken. ~~For the FFY 2008 APR submission, States are not required to report the reasons for delays when receipt of services is not timely.~~
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)	**Data Source:** Data collected on Table 2 of Information Collection 1820-0557 (*Report of Program Settings Where Early Intervention Services are Provided to Children with Disabilities and Their Families in Accordance with Part C*). **Measurement:** Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the	*For this indicator, report 618 data that were collected on a date between October 1 and December 1, ~~2008~~ 2009 and due on February 1, ~~20092010~~. Sampling from State's 618 data is not allowed.* Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 2. If not, explain.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	(total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.	
3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)	**Data Source:** State selected data source. **Measurement:** Outcomes: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. Progress categories for A, B and C: a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100. b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100. c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with	*Sampling of **infants and toddlers with IFSPs** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)* Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States will provide baseline and targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for baseline for FFY 2008 and six numbers for targets for each of the FFYs 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012~~2009 and 2010~~). ~~For FFYs 2008, 2009 and 2010, provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes. Provide baseline, targets and Summary Statement data as noted in the table below.~~

~~FFY 2008: Due 2/1/10~~	~~FFY 2009: Due 2/1/11~~	~~FFY 2010: Due 2/1/12~~
~~Report progress data and establish baseline (two Summary Statements for three Outcomes – six percentages) for FFY 2008 and six targets for each of the FFYs 2009 and 2010~~	~~Report progress data; calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets~~	~~Report progress data: calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets~~

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	IFSPs assessed)] times 100. d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100. e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100. **Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes ~~(use for FFY 2008-2009 reporting)~~:** **Summary Statement 1:** Of those infants and toddlers who entered and 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.	For FFYs 2009 (due 2/1/2011), 2010 (due 2/1/2012), 2011 (due 2/1/2013) and 2012 (due 2/3/2014) report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes. In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the ECO Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a scored of 6 or 7 on the COSF. In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COSF. If the State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i), the State must report data in two ways. First, it must report on all eligible children but exclude its at-risk infants and toddlers (i.e., include just those infants and toddlers experiencing developmental delay (or "developmentally delayed children") or having a diagnosed physical or mental condition that has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay (or "children with diagnosed conditions"). Second, the State must separately report outcome data on either: (1) just its at-risk infants and toddlers; or (2) aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C (including developmentally delayed children, children with diagnosed conditions, and at-risk infants and toddlers). The Early Childhood Outcomes Center has resources to assist States in submitting their early childhood outcomes data including a reporting

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	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.	template and a calculator tool for calculating the summary statements. These tools are available at: http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~ECO/
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family: A. Know their rights; B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and C. Help their children develop and learn. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)	**Data Source:** State selected data source. State must clarify the data source in the State Performance Plan. **Measurement:** A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100. B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100. C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.	*Sampling of **families participating in Part C** is allowed. When sampling is used, a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates must be submitted to OSEP. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instruction on sampling.)* States should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Include a description of how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation. If States are using a survey and the survey is revised or a new survey is adopted, States must submit a copy with the APR.
Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C		
Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find		
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.	**Data Source:** Data collected on Table 1 of Information Collection	*For this indicator, report 618 data that were collected on a date between October 1 and December 1, ~~2008~~ 2009 and due on February 1, ~~2009~~2010. Sampling*

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)	1820-0557 (*Report of Children Receiving Early Intervention Services in Accordance with Part C*). **Measurement:** Percent=[(# of infants and toddler birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to national data.	*from State's 618 data is not allowed.* Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain.
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)	**Data Source:** Data collected on Table 1 of Information Collection 1820-0557 (*Report of Children Receiving Early Intervention Services in Accordance with Part C*). **Measurement:** Percent=[(# of infants and toddler birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to national data.	*For this indicator, report 618 data that were collected on a date between October 1 and December 1, ~~2008~~ 2009 and due on February 1, ~~2009~~2010. Sampling from State's 618 data is not allowed.* Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain.
7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPsfor whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)	**Data Source:** Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must address the timeline from point of referral to initial IFSP meeting based on actual, not an average, number of days. **Measurement:** Percent = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed)] times 100. Account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.	*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database,* describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period. Targets must be 100%. Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation. States are not required to include in their calculation

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to include 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, these numbers are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances. Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous APR. The State must demonstrate correction as set forth in OSEP's October 17, 2008 Letter to Dear Colleague and September 3, 2008 FAQs. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. ~~For the FFY 2008 APR submission, States are not required to report the reasons for delays when evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings are not timely.~~
Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition		
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool	**Data Source:** Data to be taken from monitoring or State data	*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database,* describe the time

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: A. IFSPs with transition steps and services; B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)	system. **Measurement:** A. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C)] times 100. B. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100. C. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100. Account for untimely transition conferences, including reasons for delays.	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. Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation. Targets must be 100%. Indicator 8B: The State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parents of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or the denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any opt-out policy must be in writing and on file with the Department as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)((9)(A)(ii)(I). Indicator 8C: The State should not include in the calculation (in either the numerator or denominator) children for whom the family did not provide approval to conduct the transition conference. States are not required to include in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to include in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, these numbers are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances. Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance separately for Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous APR. The State must demonstrate correction as set forth in OSEP's October 17, 2008 Letter to Dear Colleague and September 3, 2008 FAQs. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. ~~For the FFY 2008 APR submission, States are not required to report the reasons for delays when transition conferences are not timely.~~
Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision		
9. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)	**Data Source:** Data to be taken from State monitoring, complaints, hearings and other general supervision system components. Indicate the number of EIS programs monitored using different components of the State's general supervision system. **Measurement:** Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year	*Describe the process for selecting EIS programs for monitoring.* Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation. Include all findings of noncompliance regardless of the specific level of noncompliance. Targets must be 100%.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	of identification: a. # of findings of noncompliance. b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100. States are required to use the "Indicator 9 Worksheet" to report data for this indicator (see Attachment ~~A~~1).	Report on the number of findings of noncompliance made in ~~2007~~ 2008 – ~~2008~~ 2009 (July 1, ~~2007~~ 2008 – June 30, ~~2008~~2009) and corrected as soon as possible and in no case later than one year from identification. In presenting the compliance data, disaggregate the findings by components of the State's general supervision system, including monitoring (on-site visits, self-assessments, local performance plans and annual performance reports, desk audits, data reviews) and dispute resolution (complaints and due process hearings). Findings must also be disaggregated by SPP/APR indicator and other areas of noncompliance. Describe the other areas of noncompliance. Provide detailed information about the correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous APR, including any revisions to general supervision procedures, technical assistance provided and/or any enforcement actions that were taken. The State must demonstrate correction as set forth in OSEP's October 17, 2008 Letter to Dear Colleague and September 3, 2008 FAQs. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed, and any enforcement actions that were taken. Provide detailed information regarding the correction of noncompliance related to a specific indicator under the specific indicator, e.g. correction of noncompliance related to early childhood transition conferences would be described under Indicator 8C. States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
10. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)	**Data Source:** Data collected on Table 4 of Information Collection 1820-0678 (*Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*). **Measurement:** Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.	*Sampling is not allowed.* Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Targets must be 100%. Provide detailed information about the actions the State is taking to ensure compliance with complaint resolution timeline requirements. If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data reported in Table 4, explain. States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.
11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)	**Data Source:** Data collected on Table 4 of Information Collection 1820-0678 (*Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*). **Measurement:** Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.	*Sampling is not allowed.* Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Targets must be 100%. Provide detailed information about the actions the State is taking to ensure compliance. If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data reported in Table 4, explain. States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.
12. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)	**Data Source:** Data collected on Table 4 of Information Collection 1820-0678 (*Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*). **Measurement:** Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.	*Sampling is not allowed.* Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches ten or greater, the State must develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report them in the corresponding APR.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		States may express their targets in a range, e.g., 75-85%. If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data reported in Table 4, explain. States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.
13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)	**Data Source:** Data collected on Table 4 of Information Collection 1820-0678 (*Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*). **Measurement:** Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.	*Sampling is not allowed.* Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches ten or greater, the State must develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report them in the corresponding APR. The consensus among mediation practitioners is that 75-85% is a reasonable rate of mediations that result in agreements and is consistent with national mediation success rate data. States may express their targets in a range, e.g., 75-85%. If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data reported in Table 4, explain. States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.
14. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)	**Data Source:** State selected data sources, including data from the State data system and SPP/APR. **Measurement:** State reported data, including 618 data, State performance plan, and annual performance reports, are:	Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation. Targets must be 100% for timeliness and accuracy. If the State has not reached its target, provide information about the actions the State is taking to ensure compliance, including the State's mechanisms for ensuring error free, consistent, valid

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count and settings and November 1 for exiting and dispute resolution); and b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement. States are required to use the "Indicator 14 Data Rubric" for reporting data for this indicator (see Attachment ~~B~~2).	and reliable data. States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.