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

Part C Indicator Measurement Table

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 Individual Family Service Plans (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 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.* 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. 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. 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 report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		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. Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in the Office of Special Education Programs' (OSEP's) response table for the previous SPP/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. 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.
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 under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).	*Sampling from the 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 618 data reported in Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	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.	2. If not, explain.
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	*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.)* 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. 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.* 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. Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	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. **Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:** **Summary Statement 1:** Of those infants and toddlers who entered 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.	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 Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Process (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. In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS. 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).

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	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.	
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 describe the data source in the SPP/APR. **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, 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.)* Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation. Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR. Report the number of families to whom the surveys were distributed. Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the infant or toddler, and geographic location in the State. If the analysis shows that the demographics of the families responding are not representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		enrolled in the Part C program, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to families (*e.g.*, by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person), if a survey was used, and how responses were collected. States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.
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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)	**Data Source:** Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)) and Census (for the denominator). **Measurement:** Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100.	*Sampling from the 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 why.
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 under IDEA section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)) and Census (for the denominator). **Measurement:** Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100.	*Sampling from the 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 why.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
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)	**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 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. 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 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. Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/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,

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken. 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.
Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition		
8. 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 State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (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.	**Data Source:** Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system. **Measurement:** 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. 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 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. C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all	Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation. 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. Indicators 8A and 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 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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)	parties not more than 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. Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.	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. 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 of Education 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). Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator. 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. Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/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. 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.
Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision		
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 under section 615 of the IDEA are adopted). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)	**Data Source:** Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)). **Measurement:** Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.	*Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.* This indicator is not applicable to a State that has adopted Part C due process procedures under section 639 of the IDEA. 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 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR. 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, explain.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.
10. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)	**Data Source:** Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)). **Measurement:** Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.	*Sampling from the State's 618 data 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 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and report them in the corresponding SPP/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, explain. States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

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 and their families. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE INDICATOR/MEASUREMENT –

Baseline Data: In its FFY 2013 SPP/APR, due February 2, 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 Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Targets: In its FFY 2013 SPP/APR, due February 2, 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 and their Families. 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 and their families 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 infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and must be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 11. 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 and their Families;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, in addition to the Phase I 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

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) 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 outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and Their Families (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

(A) Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2014 through FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (*e.g.*, progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (*e.g.*, a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

(B) Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, *e.g.*, a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (*i.e.*, April 3, 2017). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (*e.g.*, governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (*e.g.*, for the FFY 2016 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2017, *i.e.*, July 1, 2017-June 30, 2018).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-

based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (*e.g.*, behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (*e.g.*, progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

(C) Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (*e.g.*, for the FFY 2016 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2017, *i.e.*, July 1, 2017-June 30, 2018) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

Paperwork Burden Statement