

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

Part C Indicator Measurement Table¹

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments		
<p>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)</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p><i>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.</i></p> <p>Targets must be 100%.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has</p>

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://spp-apr-calendar.rfcnetwork.org/explorer/view/id/446/?3#category3>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		<p>identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances 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.</p> <p>Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous APR. 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, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.</p>
<p>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)</p>	<p>Data Source: Data collected under IDEA section 618</p> <p>Measurement: Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.</p>	<p><i>For this indicator, report 618 data that were collected on a date between October 1 and December 1, 2013 and due on February 1, 2014. Sampling from State's 618 data is not allowed.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.</p> <p>The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 2. If not, explain.</p>
<p>3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:</p>	<p>Data Source: State selected data source.</p>	<p><i>Sampling of infants and toddlers with IFSPs is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining</i></p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
<p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)</p>	<p>Measurement:</p> <p>Outcomes:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>Progress categories for A, B and C:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p><i>how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See <u>General Instructions</u> page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)</i></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 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.</p> <p>In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COSF.</p> <p>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</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	<p>comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Measurement for Summary Statement 1:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Measurement for Summary Statement 2:</p> <p>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</p>	<p>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).</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.	
<p>4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Know their rights; B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and C. Help their children develop and learn. <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)</p>	<p>Data Source: State selected data source. State must clarify the data source in the State Performance Plan.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p><i>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.)</i></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C		
Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find		
<p>5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p>	<p>Data Source: Data collected under IDEA section 618</p> <p>Measurement: Percent=[(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to national</p>	<p><i>For this indicator, report 618 data that were collected on a date between October 1 and December 1, 2013 and due on February 1, 2014. Sampling from State's 618 data is not allowed.</i></p> <p>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</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	data.	with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain.
<p>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)</p>	<p>Data Source: Data collected under IDEA section 618</p> <p>Measurement: Percent=[(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to national data.</p>	<p><i>For this indicator, report 618 data that were collected on a date between October 1 and December 1, 2013 and due on February 1, 2014. Sampling from State's 618 data is not allowed.</i></p> <p>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.</p>
<p>7. 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)</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Measurement: 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) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.</p> <p>Account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.</p>	<p><i>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.</i></p> <p>Targets must be 100%.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		<p>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.</p> <p>Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response table for the previous APR. 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, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.</p>
Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition		
<p>8. The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:</p> <p>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;</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Data Source: Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have 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 their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.</p> <p>B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third</p>	<p>Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.</p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.</p> <p>Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also 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.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
<p>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.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p>	<p>birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.</p> <p>C. Percent = [(# 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) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.</p> <p>Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.</p>	<p>Indicator 8A: 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 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.</p> <p>Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) 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 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 written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department as part of the State’s Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).</p> <p>Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.</p> <p>Indicator 8C: 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</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		<p>family circumstances 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.</p> <p>Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous APR. 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, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.</p>
Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision		
<p>9. 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)</p>	<p>Data Source: Data collected under IDEA section 618</p> <p>Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.</p>	<p><i>Sampling is not allowed.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.</p> <p>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 and targets and report them in the corresponding APR.</p> <p>States may express their targets in a range, e.g., 75-85%.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		<p>If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data, explain.</p> <p>States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.</p>
<p>10. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p>	<p>Data Source: Data collected under IDEA section 618</p> <p>Measurement: Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.</p>	<p><i>Sampling is not allowed.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.</p> <p>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 and report them in the corresponding APR.</p> <p>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%.</p> <p>If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data, explain.</p> <p>States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.</p>

INDICATOR 11 – STATE SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLAN

MONITORING PRIORITY – GENERAL SUPERVISION

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

MEASUREMENT: The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for infants and toddlers with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE INDICATOR/MEASUREMENT –

Baseline Data: In its FFY 2013 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2015, the State must provide FFY 2013 baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Results for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2013 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2015, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the five years from FFY 2014 through-FFY 2018. The State's FFY 2018 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's FFY 2013 baseline data.

Updated data: In its FFYs 2014 through FFY 2018 SPPs/APRs, due February 2016 through February 2020, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2014 through FFY 2018 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

OVERVIEW OF THE THREE PHASES OF THE SSIP: It is of the utmost importance to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities by improving early intervention services. Stakeholders, including parents of infants and toddlers with disabilities, early intervention service (EIS) programs and providers, the State Interagency Coordinating Council, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and must be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis (which the State must include with the February 2, 2015 submission of its SPP/APR for FFY 2013):

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, in addition to the Phase 1 content (including any updates) outlined above, the State must include with the February 1, 2016 submission of its SPP/APR for FFY 2014):

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for EIS Program and/or EIS Provider Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above, the State must include with the February 1, 2017 submission of its SPP/APR for FFY 2015, and update in 2018, 2019, and 2020):

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

SPECIFIC CONTENT OF EACH PHASE OF THE SSIP

Phase I: Analysis

Phase I of the SSIP includes a detailed analysis that will guide the selection of coherent improvement strategies to increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in EIS programs and/or EIS providers to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities. Phase I must include the following five areas:

- **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 Measureable Result for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities, 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.
- **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. 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.
- **State-identified Measureable Result for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities:** A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) may, but need not, be an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-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)).
- **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 result(s). 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. 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 Measureable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities.
- **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 result(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities.

Phase II: Plan

The focus of Phase II is on building State capacity to support EIS programs and/or EIS providers with the implementation of evidence-based practices that will lead to measureable improvement in the State-identified result(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities. Phase II builds on the data and infrastructure analyses, coherent improvement strategies, and the theory of action developed in Phase I. The plan developed in Phase II includes the activities, steps and resources required to implement the coherent improvement strategies, with attention to the research on implementation, timelines for implementation and measures needed to evaluate implementation and impact on the State-identified result(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities.

- **Infrastructure Development:** Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and/or EIS providers to implement and scale up evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified result(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities. Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and initiatives in the State, including other early learning initiatives such as Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge and the Home Visiting program, which impacts infants and toddlers with disabilities. This section must also identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts. In addition, the State should specify how it will involve multiple offices within the State lead agency (LA), as well as other State agencies (such as the State educational agency or SEA if different from the LA), in the improvement of its infrastructure.
- **Support for EIS Program and/or EIS Provider Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices:** Specify how the State will support EIS programs and/or EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in LA, EIS program and/or EIS provider practices to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities. This section must identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; how the expected outcomes of the improvement strategies will be measured; and timelines for completion. In addition, the State should specify how it will involve multiple offices within the LA (or other State agencies including the SEA) to support EIS programs and/or EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.
- **Evaluation:** The evaluation must include short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measureable improvement in the State-identified result(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and long-term objectives as those children enter preschool and kindergarten. The evaluation must be aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP, include how stakeholders will be involved, and include the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP. The evaluation must specify how the State will use the information from the evaluation to examine the effectiveness of the implementation of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the State-identified result(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities, and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary, and how the information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with the evaluation described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. This will include data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress in achieving the State-identified Measurable Result for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision. Also, the State must provide a rationale for any revisions that have been made, or revisions the State plans to make, in the SSIP in response to evaluation data, and describe how stakeholders were included in the decision-making process.

PAPERWORK BURDEN STATEMENT

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. It is estimated that each respondent will spend approximately 1,100 hours completing the APR. These estimates include time for reviewing instructions, searching any existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection required to obtain or retain benefits (20 U.S.C. 1416(b)(1); 20 U.S.C. 1442; 20 U.S.C. 1416(b)(2)(C)(ii)). Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1820-0578. Note: Please do not return the completed Part C SPP or APR forms to this address.