

IA Part C

FFY2014 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Executive Summary:

The table below summarizes targets, actual data, status for meeting targets and slippage for indicators C1 through C10 as reported in the FFY 2014 APR.

Indicator	Target %	Data %	Status	Slippage
1	100	98.72	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
2	96.60	98.92	Met Target	No Slippage
3A1	44.63	45.22	Met Target	No Slippage
3A2	69.90	68.00	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
3B1	50.33	49.70	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
3B2	50.09	52.06	Met Target	No Slippage
3C1	56.08	56.56	Met Target	No Slippage
3C2	71.24	69.83	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
4A	93.00	79.84	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
4B	93.00	85.86	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
4C	93.00	83.25	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
5	1.35	1.61	Met Target	No Slippage
6	2.50	2.94	Met Target	No Slippage
7	100	99.29	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
8A	100	99.47	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
8B	100	100	Met Target	No Slippage
8C	100	99.30	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
9	NA	NA	NA	NA
10	NA	NA	NA	NA

All findings of noncompliance reported in the FFY 2013 APR were corrected and verified within the 365 day timeline.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part C requirements are met, e.g., monitoring systems, dispute resolution systems.

See attached PDF which includes all sections of the introduction.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
introduction iowa apr.pdf	Cindy Weigel		<input type="button" value="R"/> e m o v e

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to early intervention service (EIS) programs.

See PDF attached to General Supervision System section which includes all sections of the introduction.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

See PDF attached to General Supervision System section which includes all sections of the introduction.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part C results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

See PDF attached to General Supervision System section which includes all sections of the introduction.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

FFY 2014 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2013 performance of each EIS Program or Provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2013 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2013 APR in 2015, is available.

See PDF attached to General Supervision System section which includes all sections of the introduction.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 1: Timely provision of services

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: 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)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		100%	100%	100%	100%	99.25%	97.51%	99.45%	99.44%	98.86%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
3460	3918	98.86%	100%	97.19%

Explanation of Slippage

Iowa experienced a slight decrease of -1.67% from last year, yet achieved substantial compliance for timely services (97.19%). 2.81% were reported to be untimely due to staff shortages, vacation, illness, or scheduling. Reasons for untimely services were identified by Regional Grantees and the Lead Agency through monitoring activities.

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner)

348

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

The data was selected from the full reporting period.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Data for this indicator were taken from the statewide Iowa Information Management System (IMS) database for the current full reporting period and reflect all new early intervention services from both initial IFSPs and subsequent IFSPs. No sampling was used to conduct this review. The monitoring cycle occurs annually with all regional grantees. The lead agency conducted the reviews using an Excel data collection form.

Data are based on the actual number of days, not the average, between parental consent and the date specified on the IFSP service log notes for delivery of first service. Services are considered timely if initiated within 30 calendar days from the date in which consent for services was obtained (State criteria).

Iowa has reported separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances in the appropriate field above.

The State remained virtually unchanged from last reporting period (98.86% FFY 2013, 98.72% FFY 2014) producing a gap of 1.28% between the current year data and the 100% target, achieving substantial compliance for timely services. Data indicated that 5,718 out of 6,262 (91.31%) new services were provided within the 30 day timeline. An additional 464/6262 (7.41%) services were untimely due to exceptional family circumstances. Eighty children's services were untimely due to system reasons defined as staff shortages, vacation, illness, or scheduling.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
19	19	null	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Four regional grantees did not meet the 100% target in FFY 2013 and were notified of findings of noncompliance. The four regional grantees were required to analyze root causes and correct each case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the provider, as soon as possible and no later than one year from the date of notification of noncompliance. The corrective actions were completed followed by verification by the lead agency. All four regional grantees made corrections within the 365 day timeline (including the State's verification of correction) and met requirements for timely correction. The lead agency monitoring consultant was responsible for verifying timely correction via I-STAR.

In each region that had findings of noncompliance, after technical assistance and corrective activities occurred, a follow-up review of data from five IFSPs with dates subsequent to the corrective activities was conducted. The Regional Grantees demonstrated implementation of the requirement with 100% compliance for timely services. The Regional Grantees made corrections within the 365 day timeline (including the State's verification of correction) and met requirements for timely correction.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The lead agency verified that the four regional grantees corrected noncompliance for FFY 2013 using Iowa's System to Achieve Results (I-STAR). I-STAR has been used for monitoring correction of all individual child noncompliance including verification of correction (Prong 2) within the 365 day timeline. The lead agency monitoring consultant is responsible for verifying timely correction via I-STAR.

Corrective actions included assuring that services were provided even though the timeline was not met unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program. The children that did not receive services within 30 days did in fact receive the early intervention services at a later date. The regional grantees made corrections within the 365 day timeline (including the State's verification of correction) and met requirements for timely correction.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

In the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: 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)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			96.20%	96.30%	96.40%	96.50%	96.60%	96.60%	96.60%	96.60%
Data		96.40%	97.61%	98.40%	98.52%	99.05%	98.89%	98.64%	98.57%	98.51%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	96.60%	96.60%	96.60%	96.60%	96.60%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	3,402	
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	3,439	

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
3,402	3,439	98.51%	96.60%	98.92%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: 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)

FFY 2014 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Does your 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)? **No**

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A1	2008	Target ≥						40.13%	41.63%	43.13%	44.63%	44.63%
		Data					40.13%	40.33%	40.14%	43.36%	43.33%	46.53%
A2	2008	Target ≥						65.40%	66.90%	68.40%	69.90%	69.90%
		Data					65.40%	66.35%	68.94%	68.38%	68.03%	71.40%
B1	2008	Target ≥						45.83%	47.33%	48.83%	50.33%	50.33%
		Data					45.83%	40.20%	47.20%	47.83%	47.34%	50.26%
B2	2008	Target ≥						45.59%	47.09%	48.59%	50.09%	50.09%
		Data					45.59%	46.05%	51.07%	51.04%	51.99%	54.38%
C1	2008	Target ≥						51.58%	53.08%	54.58%	56.08%	56.08%
		Data					51.58%	48.82%	52.72%	54.13%	55.53%	58.99%
C2	2008	Target ≥						66.74%	68.24%	69.74%	71.24%	71.24%
		Data					66.74%	64.93%	71.38%	70.97%	69.86%	72.77%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	44.63%	45.13%	45.63%	46.13%	46.63%
Target A2 ≥	69.90%	70.40%	70.90%	71.40%	71.90%
Target B1 ≥	50.33%	50.83%	51.33%	51.83%	52.33%
Target B2 ≥	50.09%	50.59%	51.09%	51.59%	52.09%
Target C1 ≥	56.08%	56.58%	57.08%	57.58%	58.08%
Target C2 ≥	71.24%	71.74%	72.24%	72.74%	73.24%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

Corrected A2 2018 target. Number did not autofill correctly from last APR.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	3411.00
--	---------

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

FFY 2014 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	6.00	0.25%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	619.00	26.31%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	128.00	5.44%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	388.00	16.49%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1212.00	51.51%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	516.00	1141.00	46.53%	44.63%	45.22%
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	1600.00	2353.00	71.40%	69.90%	68.00%

Explanation of A2 Slippage

Data indicate that the percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations for positive social-emotional skills by the time they turned three years of age or exited the Part C program was slightly below the target of 69.90% by 1.90% (68.00%). This was also a decrease from the previous reporting period (71.40%) by 3.40%.

Additional analysis of the data for Functioning within Age Expectations showed that five regional grantees missed the state target by 3.79% to 10.23% and four regional grantees met or exceeded the target.

The lead agency will continue to monitor progress for all regions on this indicator through regularly scheduled data verification reports, file reviews, technical assistance, support and monitoring implementation of corrective action plans. Monitoring will include data and root cause analysis by both the lead agency and regional grantees.

Outcome B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	8.00	0.34%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	840.00	35.70%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	280.00	11.90%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	558.00	23.71%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	667.00	28.35%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	838.00	1686.00	50.26%	50.33%	49.70%
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	1225.00	2353.00	54.38%	50.09%	52.06%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
--	--------------------	------------------------

FFY 2014 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	8.00	0.34%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	548.00	23.29%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	154.00	6.54%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	570.00	24.22%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1073.00	45.60%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	724.00	1280.00	58.99%	56.08%	56.56%
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	1643.00	2353.00	72.77%	71.24%	69.83%

Explanation of C2 Slippage

Data indicate that the percent of infants and toddlers who were Functioning Within Age Expectations for Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs by the time they turned three years of age or exited the Part C program was slightly below the target of 71.24% by 1.41% (69.83%). This was also a decrease from the previous reporting period (72.77%) by 2.94%.

Additional analysis of the data for Functioning within Age Expectations showed that five regional grantees missed the state target by 0.79% to 15.64% and four regional grantees met the State targets for Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs.

The lead agency continued to emphasize the ECO decision-making process: 1) align the "progress" question on the ECO form with procedures; 2) use of the Decision-Making Tree document; 3) use of assessment data when making ECO rating decisions; and 4) understanding the relationship of ECO with Iowa's Early Learning Standards, curriculum and assessment.

The lead agency has used the OSEP-funded National ECO Center's training materials and resources to ensure quality professional development for ECO (e.g., Decision Tree for Summary Rating Discussions, Age-Expected Child Development Resources and Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF) Training Materials). Use of the ECO training materials has provided assurance that all IFSP teams in the state have been trained to implement consistent procedures for gathering, analyzing and reporting these data on the ECO Summary Form.

The lead agency will continue to monitor progress for all regions on this indicator through regularly scheduled data verification reports, file reviews, technical assistance, support and monitoring implementation of corrective action plans. Monitoring will include data and root cause analysis by both the lead agency and regional grantees.

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? Yes

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: 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)

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2005	Target ≥			90.00%	90.00%	91.00%	92.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%
		Data		89.90%	96.40%	96.36%	96.25%	97.29%	97.91%	98.19%	90.00%	84.02%
B	2005	Target ≥			89.50%	89.50%	90.00%	91.00%	92.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%
		Data		89.20%	95.90%	95.05%	95.97%	97.29%	97.62%	98.19%	93.49%	87.57%
C	2005	Target ≥			91.00%	91.00%	92.00%	93.00%	94.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%
		Data		90.50%	95.80%	94.61%	95.82%	96.72%	96.72%	97.29%	91.11%	84.91%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%
Target B ≥	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%
Target C ≥	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent families participating in Part C	382.00
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	305.00
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	382.00
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	328.00
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	382.00
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	318.00
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	382.00

FFY 2014 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	84.02%	93.00%	79.84%
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	87.57%	93.00%	85.86%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	84.91%	93.00%	83.25%

Explanation of A Slippage

Iowa experienced slippage in indicator 4A by 4.18% (79.84%) from the previous fiscal year (84.02%) and missed the State target of 93.00% by 13.16%.

Slippage for indicator 4A may be the result of implementing new procedures for collecting survey data. For the current reporting period and the previous reporting period, the lead agency assumed responsibility for distributing and collecting surveys. Surveys were disseminated in two ways: (1) paper surveys were mailed directly to families who did not have email addresses or spoke languages other than English, and (2) passcodes and a link to an online survey were emailed to families that had email addresses. The rationale for moving survey responsibilities to the lead agency was to increase the reliability and validity of survey methodology. The lead agency was able to track which surveys were returned through the online monitoring system, I-STAR (Iowa's System to Achieve Results).

Family survey data were analyzed by the Early ACCESS State Work Team, State Interagency Coordinating Council, and the Early ACCESS Leadership Group. Stakeholders pointed out that the total surveys returned were similar to the last reporting period. There is agreement that the new process for administering the family surveys will produce more reliable and valid results, providing a more realistic picture of family outcomes.

Regional grantees continue to have the opportunity to review and analyze the results for their own surveys. One tool that has been shared with each region is the *Relationship of Quality Practices to Child and Family Outcome Measurement Results* (April 2012) published through NECTAC, ECO, and the RRC program. Regions will be able to use this tool to assist in identifying quality practices that can help increase specific family outcomes.

Explanation of B Slippage

Iowa experienced a slippage in indicator 4B by 1.71% (85.86%) from the previous fiscal year (87.57%) and missed the State target of 93.00% by 7.14%.

Slippage for indicator 4B may be the result of implementing new procedures for collecting survey data. For the current and the previous reporting period, the lead agency assumed responsibility for distributing and collecting surveys. Surveys were disseminated in two ways: (1) paper surveys were mailed directly to families who did not have email addresses or spoke languages other than English, and (2) passcodes and a link to an online survey were emailed to families that had email addresses. The rationale for moving survey responsibilities to the lead agency was to increase the reliability and validity of survey methodology. The lead agency was able to track which surveys were returned through the online monitoring system, I-STAR (Iowa's System to Achieve Results).

Family survey data were analyzed by the Early ACCESS State Work Team, State Interagency Coordinating Council and the Early ACCESS Leadership Group. Stakeholders pointed out that the total surveys returned were similar to the last reporting period. There is agreement that the new process for administering the family surveys will produce more reliable and valid results, providing a more realistic picture of family outcomes.

Regional grantees continue to have the opportunity to review and analyze the results for their own surveys. One tool that has been shared with each region is the *Relationship of Quality Practices to Child and Family Outcome Measurement Results* (April 2012) published through NECTAC, ECO, and the RRC program. Regions will be able to use this tool to assist in identifying quality practices that can help increase specific family outcomes.

Explanation of C Slippage

Iowa experienced slippage in indicator 4C by 1.66% (83.25%) from the previous fiscal year (84.91%) and missed the State target of 93.00% by 9.75%.

Slippage for indicator 4C may be the result of implementing new procedures for collecting survey data. For the current and the previous reporting period, the lead agency assumed responsibility for distributing and collecting surveys. Surveys were disseminated in two ways: (1) paper surveys were mailed directly to families who did not have email addresses or spoke languages other than English, and (2) passcodes and a link to an online survey were emailed to families that had email addresses. The rationale for moving survey responsibilities to the lead agency was to increase the reliability and validity of survey methodology. The lead agency was able to track which surveys were returned through the online monitoring system, I-STAR (Iowa's System to Achieve Results).

Family survey data were analyzed by the Early ACCESS State Work Team, State Interagency Coordinating Council and the Early ACCESS Leadership Group. Stakeholders pointed out that the total surveys returned were similar to the last reporting period. There is agreement that the new process for administering the family surveys will produce more reliable and valid results, providing a more realistic picture of family outcomes.

Regional grantees continue to have the opportunity to review and analyze the results for their own surveys. One tool that has been shared with each region is the *Relationship of Quality Practices to Child and Family Outcome Measurement Results* (April 2012) published through NECTAC, ECO, and the RRC program. Regions will be able to use this tool to assist in identifying quality practices that can help increase specific family outcomes.

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

The sample chosen to receive the family surveys were drawn from the Information Management System

(IMS) database and are representative of the Regions and the State.

The table below illustrates that the survey sample is representative of the Part C population for Race/Ethnicity as all categories show less than a 1% difference.

Percent Race/Ethnicity Survey Population Compared to Part C Population.

Race	Part C Population	Survey Population	Difference
Hispanic/Latino	11.95%	10.09%	-1.87%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.52%	0.51%	-0.01%
Asian	2.12%	1.77%	-0.36%
Black or African American	5.38%	4.22%	-1.16%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.26%	0.23%	-0.03%
White	74.47%	77.04%	2.57%
Two or More Races	5.29%	6.15%	0.86%
Total	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%

Source. Iowa Information Management System (IMS), FFY 2014.

Similarly, the there was only a 1.13% difference for gender between the survey sample and the Part C population.

Gender	Part C Population	Survey Population	Difference
Female	39.78%	40.91%	1.13%
Male	60.22%	59.09%	-1.13%
Total	100%	100%	0.00%

Source. Iowa Information Management System (IMS), FFY 2014.

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No



Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State



No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

The sample for the current reporting period consisted of all infants and toddlers who had an annual IFSP meeting between July 1, 2014 and May 15, 2015. Families with recorded email addresses were emailed the survey through the I-STAR data system. Families who did not have a current email address were mailed surveys with return envelopes. If families needed an interpreter for any reason, the lead agency worked with regional grantees to have a paper survey completed. All paper surveys were anonymously mailed to the lead agency and recorded in the I-STAR system by the monitoring consultant or support staff. Approximately 1,512 surveys were either mailed or emailed to families, with a total of 382 surveys completed (return rate of 25%). Additionally, the 382 surveys returned out of the 3,349 infants and toddlers receiving Early ACCESS services on October count day is well above the sample size required for maintaining a 95% confidence level with +/- 5% margin of error (346 surveys).

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			1.10%	1.10%	1.10%	1.20%	1.30%	1.30%	1.30%	1.30%
Data		1.22%	1.42%	1.54%	1.59%	1.74%	1.63%	1.56%	1.71%	1.68%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	1.35%	1.35%	1.40%	1.40%	1.45%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	626	null
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013	4/3/2014	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	38,771	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
626	38,771	1.68%	1.35%	1.61%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			2.10%	2.10%	2.10%	2.30%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%
Data		2.33%	2.52%	2.69%	2.89%	3.05%	3.01%	3.08%	3.03%	3.03%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	2.50%	2.60%	2.60%	2.70%	2.70%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	3,439	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2014	7/2/2015	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	116,855	

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
3,439	116,855	3.03%	2.50%	2.94%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: 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)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		87.00%	90.90%	97.66%	98.73%	99.36%	99.85%	99.76%	99.84%	99.68%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
2,917	3,403	99.68%	100%	99.29%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline)	462
--	-----

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Data were selected from the full reporting period.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Data for this indicator were taken from the statewide Iowa Information Management System (IMS) database for the current full reporting period and reflect all infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for who an initial IFSP was required to be conducted. The monitoring cycle occurs annually with all regional grantees. The lead agency conducted the reviews using an Excel data collection form for every regional grantee. Data are based on the actual number of days, not the average, between date of referral and the date of the initial IFSP meeting.

Iowa has reported separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances in the appropriate field above.

FFY 2014 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The State remained virtually unchanged from last reporting period (99.68% last year and 99.29% in the current reporting year) producing a gap of 0.71% between the current year data and the 100% target, achieving substantial compliance for timely evaluations, assessments and initial IFSP meetings. Data indicated that 85.72% of infants and toddlers (2917/3403) received timely evaluations and initial IFSP meetings. An additional 13.58% (462/3403) were reported to be untimely due to exceptional family circumstances. Twenty four children's evaluations, assessments and initial IFSP meetings were untimely due to system reasons defined as staff shortages, vacation, illness, or scheduling.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
11	11	null	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Four regional grantees did not meet the 100% target and were notified of findings of noncompliance. The regional grantees were required to analyze root causes and correct each case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the provider, as soon as possible and no later than one year from date of notification of noncompliance. The corrective actions were completed followed by verification by the Lead Agency.

In each region that had findings of noncompliance, after technical assistance and corrective activities occurred, a follow-up review of data from five IFSPs with dates subsequent to the corrective activities was conducted. The Regional Grantees demonstrated implementation of the requirement with 100% compliance for timely services. The Regional Grantees made corrections within the 365 day timeline (including the State's verification of correction) and met requirements for timely correction.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The lead agency verified that the regional grantees corrected noncompliance for FFY 2013 using Iowa's System to Achieve Results (I-STAR). I-STAR has been used for monitoring correction of all individual child noncompliance including verification of correction (Prong 2) within the 365 day timeline. The lead agency monitoring consultant is responsible for verifying timely correction via I-STAR.

Corrective actions included assuring that evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings were held even though the timeline was not met unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program. The infants and toddlers that did not receive evaluations and initial IFSP meetings within 45 days did in fact have the evaluations completed and meetings held at a later date. All regions made corrections within the 365 day timeline (including the State's verification of correction) and met requirements for timely correction.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

In the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions

--

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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 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
- 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		87.00%	94.00%	97.96%	99.68%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99.76%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has 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.

Yes

No

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
743	751	99.76%	100%	99.47%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services)	4
---	---

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring



Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

All regional grantees were selected for monitoring. Data were obtained from files of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B, or children exiting Part C for other services as part of the Part C statewide file review process using Iowa's System to Achieve Results (I-STAR) monitoring system. The monitoring cycle occurs annually with all regional grantees. A random sample of children exiting Part C was created using a confidence level of 95% with a +/- 10% margin of error. State staff conducted IFSP file reviews and then desk audits were completed by the lead agency monitoring consultant. The data were then entered into the I-STAR data monitoring system which sends written notification of noncompliance to regional grantees.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	null	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Two regional grantees did not meet the 100% target in FFY 2013 and were notified of findings of noncompliance. The regional grantees was required to analyze root causes and correct each case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the provider, as soon as possible and no late than one year form the date of notification of noncompliance. The corrective actions were completed followed by verification by the lead agency.

For the two regional grantees that had findings of noncompliance, after technical assistance and corrective activities occurred, follow-up reviews of data from five IFSPs with dates subsequent to the corrective activities were conducted. Both regional grantees demonstrated implementation of the requirement with 100% compliance for developing an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days and not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday. The regional grantees made corrections within the 365 day timeline (including the State's verification of correction) and met requirements for timely correction.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The lead agency verified that the two regional grantees corrected noncompliance for FFY 2013 using Iowa's System to Achieve Results (I-STAR). I-STAR has been used for monitoring correction of all individual child noncompliance including verification of correction (Prong 2) within the 365 day timeline. The lead agency monitoring consultant is responsible for verifying timely correction via I-STAR.

Corrective actions included assuring that transition activities occurred even though the timeline was not met unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program. The two regions made corrections within the 365 day timeline (including the State's verification of correction) and met requirements for timely correction.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

In the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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 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
- 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		96.00%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

- Yes
- No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
428	428	100%	100%	100%

Number of parents who opted out (this number will be subtracted from the number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B when calculating the FFY 2014 Data)	0
---	---

Describe the method used to collect these data

Data were obtained from files of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B, or children exiting Part C for other services as part of the Part C statewide file review process using Iowa's System to Achieve Results (I-STAR) monitoring system. The monitoring cycle occurs annually with all regional grantees. A random sample of children

FFY 2014 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Exiting Part C was created using a confidence level of 95% with a +/- 10% margin of error. State staff conducted IFSP file reviews and then desk audits were completed by the lead agency monitoring consultant. The data were then entered into the I-STAR data monitoring system which sends written notification of noncompliance to regional grantees.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? No

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?



State monitoring



State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

All 9 regional grantees in the state were selected for monitoring.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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 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
- 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		87.00%	91.00%	95.25%	99.40%	99.37%	99.35%	98.73%	100%	98.71%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has 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

- Yes
- No

Number 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	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
400	428	98.71%	100%	99.30%

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference (this number will be subtracted from the number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B when calculating the FFY 2014 Data)	0
---	---

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number 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)

25

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

All regional grantees were selected for monitoring. Data were obtained from files of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B as part of the Part C statewide file review process using Iowa's System to Achieve Results (I-STAR) monitoring system. The monitoring cycle occurs annually with all regional grantees. A random sample of all children exiting Part C was created using a confidence level of 95% with a +/- 10% margin of error. State staff conducted IFSP file reviews then desk audits were completed by the lead agency monitoring consultant. The data were then entered into the I-STAR data monitoring system which sends written notification of noncompliance to regional grantees.

Iowa did not include in the calculation the number of children for whom the State identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances. The State did not include in the calculation the number of children for whom the family did not provide approval to conduct the transition conference which resulted in delays in timely transition.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	6	null	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Four regional grantees did not meet the 100% target in FFY 2013 and were notified of findings of noncompliance. Each regional grantee was required to analyze root causes and correct each case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the provider, as soon as possible and no later than one year from the date of notification of noncompliance. The corrective actions were completed followed by verification by the lead agency.

For the four regional grantees that had findings of noncompliance, after technical assistance and corrective activities occurred, follow-up reviews of data from five IFSPs with dates subsequent to the corrective activities were conducted. Each regional grantee demonstrated implementation of the requirement with 100% compliance for holding a timely transition conference at least 90 days and not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday. The regional grantees made corrections within the 365 day timeline (including the State's verification of correction) and met requirements for timely correction.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The lead agency verified that the four regional grantees corrected noncompliance for FFY 2013 using Iowa's System to Achieve Results (I-STAR). I-STAR has been used for monitoring correction of all individual child noncompliance including verification of correction (Prong 2) within the 365 day timeline. The lead agency monitoring consultant is responsible for verifying timely correction via I-STAR.

Corrective actions included assuring that transition activities occurred even though the timeline was not met unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program. The four regions made corrections within the 365 day timeline (including the State's verification of correction) and met requirements for timely correction.

OSEP Response

FFY 2014 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

In the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: 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)

Historical Data

Baseline Data:

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥										
Data										

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥					

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	null	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	null	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
null	null			

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable for the State.

Required Actions

Indicator 10: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥										
Data										

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥					

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1 Mediations held	n	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	0	0			

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2014. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

Required Actions

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014
Target		87.00%
Data	85.00%	83.25%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	89.00%	91.00%	93.00%	93.00%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

Added targets that were missing.

Description of Measure

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Overview

Iowa's Part C SSIP Phase II report and appendices A-E are attached.

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 Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families, 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.

See attached PDF for all components of the Iowa Part C SSIP.

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 and their families. 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.

See attached PDF for all components of the Iowa Part C SSIP.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and Their Families

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child- or family-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)).

Statement

See attached PDF for all components of the Iowa Part C SSIP.

Description

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 Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families. 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 and their families. 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 Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

See attached PDF for all components of the Iowa Part C SSIP.

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 Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

[Iowa IDEA Part C Theory of Action Graphic](#) Iowa IDEA Part C Theory of Action Graphic

Illustration



Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

See attached FFY 14 APR SSIP Phase II Iowa Part C report.

See attached Appendices A-E.

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) 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; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

See attached FFY 14 APR SSIP Phase II Iowa Part C report.

See attached Appendices A-E.

Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

See attached FFY 14 APR SSIP Phase II Iowa Part C report.

See attached Appendices A-E.

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

See attached FFY 14 APR SSIP Phase II Iowa Part C report.

See attached Appendices A-E.

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

I certify that I am the Director of the State's Lead Agency under Part C of the IDEA, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Selected: Lead Agency Director

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Amy Williamson

Title: Bureau Chief

Email: amy.williamson@iowa.gov

Phone: 515-339-4122