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# Introduction

**Instructions**

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State’s systems designed to drive improved results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and to ensure that the Lead Agency (LA) meets the requirements of Part C of the IDEA. This introduction must include descriptions of the State’s General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

The Alaska Department of Health & Social Services (DHSS) is the state lead agency responsible for administering and overseeing the statewide system of early intervention services in Alaska. The Alaska Part C State Office currently supports 16 local programs that provide early interventions throughout the state. These 16 agencies with the Alaska Part C Early Intervention/Infant Learning Program (EI/ILP) provide individualized services to infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families all around the state. Currently, there are 33,667 0-3 year-aged children in the State of Alaska; in FFY19, 10.2% of the 0-3 population (3,433) in Alaska were referred to the Alaska Part C program, with a 28.3% eligibility rate of referred children (973).   
 The number of referrals to the Part C Program in FFY19 has increased from FFY18, likely due a number of causes including an increase in CAPTA and other outside referral sources and improved recruitment strategies from the Part C agencies. In FFY19, referrals from the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) made up 27.4% of all referrals, making OCS and CAPTA referrals the number one referral source for FFY19. Physician and parent referrals remain the second and third referral sources with 21.6% and 16.3%, followed by the NICU and other hospitals and health clinics. It is important to note that both parents and physician referrals have the highest rates of enrollments from their referrals at 36.9% for physicians and 48.2% for parents; CAPTA enrollments followed third at 13.5%. Although referrals and enrollments were both less than projected at the beginning of the fiscal year, the dynamics of the referrals showcase that Alaska is in a period of transition in regards to how children are being identified, and who is taking the time and making the effort to get them enrolled in the services they need. Many of the increases noted in referrals and enrollments are due to modifying screening mandates, improving advertising and education out in Alaskan communities, and the collaborative work of many state and local agencies. Despite a tumultuous year, Alaska is very pleased at the work done on all levels to achieve this improving progress.   
In regards to COVID-19, Alaska did not witness and overwhelming impact on any of the 11 indicators collected within the SPP/APR, despite the onset and ongoing nature of the COVID-19 pandemic. Certain indicators relating to transitions and timeliness of services were slightly effected by the pandemic, and specific instances were noted. The first positive COVID-19 case in Alaska was confirmed on March 12, 2020 (FFY19, Q3), with cases averaging around 20 per day by the end of April. By the end of June, positive cases were averaging around 40 per day. Although Alaska’s rates remained far below the national average, Alaska was starting to demonstrate an exponential growth of cases by the end of May, setting it up for massive increases of cases, hospitalizations and deaths in the coming months. Within the framework of this report, Alaska had not yet begun to see the spread of cases into the villages and rural communities, which largely left Alaska’s most rural agencies temporarily unaffected by COVID; however, more urban programs, such as those in Fairbanks and Anchorage, were already dealing with cases and restrictions set in their communities.  
On March 27, 2020, the governor of Alaska instituted mandatory lockdowns and guidelines; the Part C program, along with many other entities, moved completely to remote work. With the “telework” order and the addition of schools being closed on March 13, all early intervention services and programs had to change their tactics when it came to providing services. All of the 16 programs were able to remain open and available to their families, despite not being able to hold in-person services. Due to the changes in practice, a small number of families chose to withdraw their children from services due to a disinterest in telemedicine, a shift in family priorities and capabilities, and competing efforts to maintain balance with schools shifting to virtual lessons and changing incomes. Additionally, many transitions from Part C to Part B were delayed and/or missed, and some annual and exit evaluations were not completed on time, or at all due to the change in service requirements. Although many of the losses or suspension of services were not quantifiable and not quite “seen” in the numbers beginning of the pandemic, it is critical to understand that these losses were delayed, rather than completely avoided. FFY19 remained largely unaffected by COVID-19, but many of the issues that arose earlier in other states in regards to the pandemic started to trickle in to some of Alaska’s indicators. Throughout this report, those indicators will be highlighted and explained in detail.  
 In spite of a shifting care landscape, Alaska’s Part C Program has remained dedicated to its families, far and wide. Alaska has continued to support all of its programs both in the provision of guidance and resources; in FFY19, Alaska continued its focus on improving outcomes, correcting non-compliances and developing better trainings and policies to help all programs succeed in providing successful interventions for families.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

**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.**

Alaska Part C structure is comprised of a Lead Agency in the Alaska Department of Health and Social Services (HSS)'s Senior and Disabilities Services (SDS) division and sixteen local Early Intervention/Infant Learning Programs (EI/ILPs). Local programs are, 1) standalone EI/ILPs agencies 2) units within community non profit services agencies, 3) programs within Tribal 638s, or 40 located in an LEA. sThe local EI/ILPs are directly awarded funds from the State office through a competitive process. Additionally, all local EI/ILPs are Medicaid agents and bill both public and private funds. The state Part C office monitors fiscal systems. Through the State’s Governor’s Council on Disabilities and Special Education Alaska has an active Early Intervention Committee (EIC) that fulfills the role of the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC).  
  
Alaska’s EI/ILP services are:  
  
o Relationship-focus   
o Strengths-based   
o Family-centered   
o Outcome driven   
o Reflective based   
o Evidence Informed  
o Provided in Natural environment   
  
Accountability & Continuous Quality Improvement:  
  
Alaska Part C utilizes an integrated monitoring system to ensure statewide IDEA implementation, expedient identification and correction of noncompliance, support of evidence-based best practice and improved outcomes for enrolled children and their families. The Alaska ILP monitoring process is structured to manage the various activities that must be completed throughout the year within specific time frames for both the state office and local programs. This monitoring system includes the following components:  
  
An annual EI/ILP self-assessment is used to monitor each local EI/ILP’s level of performance including compliance. The indicators are based on the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and closely align with improving results for children and families. These include the required State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) indicators and annual selection of other critical priority indicators identified by the state with the assistance of a stakeholder group. In addition, the state ensures implementation of all IDEA requirements through the various components of the state’s general supervision system.  
  
Data are reviewed quarterly and analyzed throughout the year to identify emerging issues and initiate preventative supports including developing and/or modifying planned/targeted training and Technical Assistance (TA) (statewide and program-specific).  
  
Multiple data sources are used to respond to the monitoring indicators. The data system responds to as many indicators as possible however other data sources i.e., self-assessment follow-up, record reviews, monthly Technical Assistance (TA) calls, record requests) are used to capture indicator data not collected directly from the data system. Data analysis at the state office is used to:  
monitor all programs annually on their performance with the SPP/APR required indicators and selected other state priority indicators, track progress in the correction of noncompliance on an ongoing basis and identify targeted training and technical assistance needs to ensure improvement.  
  
On-site visits are provided to programs in order to address needs identified through ILP’s data-based decision making processes. The visits focus on the identified areas of need and are structured to provide technical assistance related to identifying and rectifying underlying issues that contribute to programs’ low performance and/or noncompliance.  
  
Verification and technical assistance visits are also made to local ILPs. The purpose of the verification visits are to ensure that the data collected through the ILP database accurately reflects program practice. Technical assistance is provided based on local ILP requests and state priorities.  
  
Steps to ensure timely and accurate data are incorporated into data system training, quarterly reporting, local EI management reports and data system edit checks.  
  
Data System:  
Alaska Part C participated in the FFY 2013 DaSy Data System Framework development for improved quality of IDEA data collection. The Alaska Part C data system was a stakeholder designed, home grown, statewide web-based data accountability system. The data (base) system development and continued updates include SPP/APR compliance reporting, local EIS management tools, database training, and technical support. The Alaska Part C Data Manager, under the direction of the Part C Coordinator, oversees the system, including: training for all database users, providing ongoing data-system technical support, evaluating system design, cleaning and assessing data quality, ensuring accurate and reliable data monitoring, safeguarding FERPA and HIPAA compliance and collaborating with early childhood data key partners (i.e. Early Hearing Detection and Intervention, Child Protective Services, Early Childhood Special Education).   
  
Complaint and Due Process Procedures:  
The EI/ILP includes procedural safeguards to protect the rights of parents and children. Parents must be informed about these procedural safeguards as defined under federal regulations at 34 CFR 303.400-438, including dispute resolution options at 34 CFR 303.430-438, so that they can be actively involved and have a leadership role in the services provided to their child and family. An initial concern about a child’s early intervention program is directed to the local Family Service Coordinator or IFSP team as soon as possible. The EI/ILP encourages resolution of disagreements at the lowest level possible. However, if a concern cannot be resolved informally, dispute resolution options are available; these dispute resolution processes help to ensure that the requirements of IDEA are being implemented within Alaska:  
  
- The state lead agency has established procedures to offer parents and early intervention service providers that choose not to use the mediation process an opportunity to meet, at a time and location convenient to all; the meeting must include a disinterested party (impartial Mediator), who is under contract with a dispute resolution entity or a parent training and information center or community parent resource center in the State, to explain the benefits of, and encourage the use of, the mediation process.  
- Mediations are scheduled no later 30-calendar days after the lead agency receives a complaint. Mediations are held in a location that is convenient to both parties; a qualified and impartial Mediator, who is trained in effective mediation techniques, meets with both parties to help find a solution to the dispute in an informal, non-adversarial atmosphere.  
- Any party not satisfied with the findings and decision of the impartial due process hearing as the right to bring a civil action in state or federal court.  
  
In addition to the mediation and due process hearing procedures, an individual or organization including those from another state may file a written, signed complaint against any public agency or private service provider, including any early intervention service provider that is violating a requirement of the Part C program. The state lead agency widely disseminates the State's complaint procedures to parents and other interested individuals, including parent training and information centers, protection and advocacy agencies and other appropriate entities. Alaska child and family rights can be found at: http://dhss.alaska.gov/dsds/Documents/InfantLearning/pdf/ilp\_parentrights.pdf

**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.**

Alaska's general supervision system activities are coordinated to improve efficient identification of state and local challenges/strengths related to implementing IDEA. The goals of this system are evidence informed service delivery, improved child and family outcomes, prevention of non-compliance, timely identification of non-compliance root causes and correction. Local providers are provided support to implement best practice, identify internal quality assurance and effectively analyze and use their data proactively to ensure IDEA compliance and improved child and family outcomes.  
  
In addition to the structure described above, Alaska utilizes a committee structure to ensure effective continuous quality improvement. Alaska currently has these committees in place: Leadership/Governance, Finance, Professional Development/Workforce, Service Delivery, Policy and Procedure Development, Public Information and Data (http://dhss.alaska.gov/dsds/Documents/InfantLearning/reports/partC/ILPsOperationsManual.pdf- page 57 ).  
  
Alaska Part C EI/ILP Program Specialists (Health Program Manager II), provide the following technical assistance (TA) to local EI/ILP agencies using regular teleconferences, on-site visitations, group meetings and written guidance to address common topics such as: database use, systems improvements and training, eligibility and service guidelines updates, natural environment specifics, child outcome process improvement, local transition successes and challenges, maintaining highly qualified staff, fiscal system design and compliance data trends.   
  
Alaska Part C state staff also participate in specialized technical assistance projects and activities from national experts. Alaska has a standing TA meeting every second Monday of the month with Anne Lucas of ECTA and has enlisted the help of data consultant, Robin Nelson of ECTA as well. Meetings with additional TAs had been added over the course of FFY19, and will most certainly continue in the following years. Additionally, there is a scheduled meeting with OSEP every first Thursday of the month; topics have included SOP, SSIP implementation and improvements and enhancing COS rating. This information was used to help determine potential strategies that could be used to improve Indicator 3.

**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.**

Alaska Part C ensures highly qualified providers through: a) Alaska System for Early Education Development ( SEED) registry, b) a Part C Credential, c) sponsoring Statewide Early Childhood conferences, and d) ongoing professional development trainings. All providers and must complete the Part C Credential and register with the SEED within 6 months of hire. The SEED is a collaborative approach to professional development integrating and recognizing the needs of a diverse workforce. Early Intervention Service positions correlate with incremental SEED levels and support continuing education for career development (https://www.threadalaska.org/docs/SEED-Career-Ladder\_EC-SA\_7-28-17.pdf).  
  
In FFY19, Alaska's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (PD) Committee continued to support and enhance: the Alaska SEED registry, efforts to update the credentialing system for highly qualified degrees required for ILP Providers and persons interested in becoming employed within Early Intervention, self-assessment with integrated Infant Mental Health competencies to programs through resources and the administration and provision of a tuition scholarship program to develop highly qualified early intervention service providers in Alaska (targeted at Occupational Therapy in FFY18 and FFY19). In addition, the PD committee has continued to expand access to providers through related disciplines being provided access to a variety of in-service and/or certification training opportunities necessary to maintain their licensure, topics of interest among providers and their connection to Part C competencies to support additional trainings, ongoing participation in collaborative planning efforts with partner programs and parents in an effort to support cross-sector professional development and developing reflective supervision activities in Alaska EI/ILP.

**Stakeholder Involvement:**

**The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP/APR, and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 11, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

Alaska Part C state staff met with numerous early childhood partners for soliciting broad stakeholder input throughout FFY19 and over the past year has continued outreach with these partners and sought their guidance when appropriate for the performance development of the Part C programs. These partners have included but are not limited to: the Early Intervention Committee (EIC/ICC), the Help Me Grow initiative and team, EIS providers, Alaska Early Learning Program Association board members, Department of Education and various staff and council members from various organizations such as the Alaska Early Childhood Coordinating Council, Alaska Association for Infant Mental Health and the Alaska Association for Education of Young Children. Soliciting stakeholder input took place through monthly meetings, teleconferences, state staff attending various council meetings and reflective discussions. Decisions regarding target setting for indicators took place semi-annually with stakeholders and members of the ICC and a survey was sent out to gather votes on specific targets, and setting appropriate numbers. Additionally, the Part C Office spoke at two separate meetings with stakeholder groups to discuss the SSIP, the ongoing progress of assessing Indicator 11, and steps the Part C Office was taking to follow the proposed timeline in the State Systemic Improvement Plan.

**Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part C results indicators (y/n)**

YES

**Reporting to the Public:**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2018 performance of each EIS Program 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 2018 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State’s SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2018 APR in 2020, is available.**

A complete copy of the State's findings regarding the performance of each EIS program and the targets in the SPP/APR can be found at the following website: http://dhss.alaska.gov/dsds/Pages/infantlearning/reports/default.aspx. In addition to the target outcomes, the State reports the results of the child and family outcomes surveys, federal and state updates and operations manuals.

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP’s coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State’s capacity to improve its SiMR data.  
  
OSEP notes that one or more of the attachments included in the State’s FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education’s IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

## Intro - OSEP Response

The State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) submitted to the Secretary its annual report that is required under IDEA section 641(e)(1)(D) and 34 C.F.R. §303.604(c). The SICC noted it has elected to support the State lead agency’s submission of its SPP/APR as its annual report in lieu of submitting a separate report. OSEP accepts the SICC form, which will not be posted publicly with the State’s SPP/APR documents.

## Intro - Required Actions

# Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Compliance indicator:** 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.

**Instructions**

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 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 84.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 98.97% | 99.51% | 99.72% | 100.00% | 99.47% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,059 | 1,195 | 99.47% | 100% | 100.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**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" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.***

136

**Include your 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).**

The data compiled for Indicator 1 reflects the actual number of days between the date the IFSP was signed and when the first day of services began. Alaska's criteria for "timely receipt of early intervention services" is intended to reflect the requirement that all IFSP services are started before or on the IFSP service start date listed within the IFSP. This requirement applies to all newly enrolled infants and toddlers who receive services, and for every additional and renewed IFSP between July 1, 2019 - June 30, 2020.

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

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).**

July 2019 - June 2020

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

Indicator 1 data is collected through the use of a database, in which all data is entered regarding children referred and enrolled into agencies under the Part C Program. Data regarding timely services is collected comparing the date that is listed on the IFSP and the first dates of service for each infant/toddler enrolled during FFY19. This data is reviewed and verified by agencies and State Technical Assistants on a quarterly basis for timeliness and accuracy. Agencies self-monitor and plan improvement activities to correct non-compliance on an ongoing basis. State technical assistance is provided when correction is not demonstrated the following quarter.  
  
In addition, the ILP database includes automated data checks and management reports for EIS agencies and Part C State Staff. These reports includes automated data cleaning and reminders reports for EIS agencies and Part C State Staff to ensure there are no missing or inaccurate data. Annual desk audits are completed by the Part C Data Manager and record reviews are conducted by Part C Program Specialists to further ensure data accuracy. Any non-compliance identified during any of our monitoring activities must be completed within 12 months of issuance of the finding.

**If needed, provide additional information about this indicator here.**

It is important to note that a total of six cases for FFY19 did not receive their services listed on their IFSP in a timely manner due to parental choices related directly to the COVID-19 pandemic. Four families declined telehealth services (did not want to participate in services virtually), and two families could not make appointments due to ill family members.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Prior to considering the findings of noncompliance from FFY 2018 corrected, the Alaska Part C Office verified that the 3 regional sites with incidents of noncompliance were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements specific to the timely provision of services. Specifically, the Part C Office reviewed subsequent updated data from the state-wide database, quarterly compliance reports and program self-assessments. After pulling additional data in the following quarter to assess program compliance after the findings were issued to the programs, it was found that both programs had reached 100% compliance. With this finding, the programs were identified as having suitably addressed their non-compliance for Indicator 1 and no further findings or corrective actions were issued.

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

The Alaska Part C Office verified through child record and data review that the 7 individual cases of noncompliance across 3 regional sites which occurred in FFY 2018 had been corrected. All infants and toddlers that had not received initial services in a timely manner were found to have eventually received their services, although late.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

## 1 - Required Actions

# Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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)

**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 (E*MAPS*)).

**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.

**Instructions**

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 2. If not, explain.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 94.50% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target>= | 96.00% | 96.50% | 96.75% | 97.00% | 97.00% |
| Data | 99.32% | 99.54% | 99.54% | 99.07% | 99.53% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target>= | 97.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska Part C state staff met with numerous early childhood partners for soliciting broad stakeholder input throughout FFY19 and over the past year has continued outreach with these partners and sought their guidance when appropriate for the performance development of the Part C programs. These partners have included but are not limited to: the Early Intervention Committee (EIC/ICC), the Help Me Grow initiative and team, EIS providers, Alaska Early Learning Program Association board members, Department of Education and various staff and council members from various organizations such as the Alaska Early Childhood Coordinating Council, Alaska Association for Infant Mental Health and the Alaska Association for Education of Young Children. Soliciting stakeholder input took place through monthly meetings, teleconferences, state staff attending various council meetings and reflective discussions. Decisions regarding target setting for indicators took place semi-annually with stakeholders and members of the ICC and a survey was sent out to gather votes on specific targets, and setting appropriate numbers. Additionally, the Part C Office spoke at two separate meetings with stakeholder groups to discuss the SSIP, the ongoing progress of assessing Indicator 11, and steps the Part C Office was taking to follow the proposed timeline in the State Systemic Improvement Plan.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/08/2020 | Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings | 918 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/08/2020 | Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs | 923 |

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 918 | 923 | 99.53% | 97.00% | 99.46% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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)

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Outcomes:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

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

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with 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.

**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.

**Instructions**

**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.

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. 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).

## 3 - Indicator Data

**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)? (yes/no)**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska Part C state staff met with numerous early childhood partners for soliciting broad stakeholder input throughout FFY19 and over the past year has continued outreach with these partners and sought their guidance when appropriate for the performance development of the Part C programs. These partners have included but are not limited to: the Early Intervention Committee (EIC/ICC), the Help Me Grow initiative and team, EIS providers, Alaska Early Learning Program Association board members, Department of Education and various staff and council members from various organizations such as the Alaska Early Childhood Coordinating Council, Alaska Association for Infant Mental Health and the Alaska Association for Education of Young Children. Soliciting stakeholder input took place through monthly meetings, teleconferences, state staff attending various council meetings and reflective discussions. Decisions regarding target setting for indicators took place semi-annually with stakeholders and members of the ICC and a survey was sent out to gather votes on specific targets, and setting appropriate numbers. Additionally, the Part C Office spoke at two separate meetings with stakeholder groups to discuss the SSIP, the ongoing progress of assessing Indicator 11, and steps the Part C Office was taking to follow the proposed timeline in the State Systemic Improvement Plan.

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A1** | 2012 | Target>= | 65.25% | 65.00% | 65.00% | 65.14% | 65.20% |
| **A1** | 65.08% | Data | 61.14% | 60.30% | 58.04% | 55.40% | NVR |
| **A2** | 2012 | Target>= | 54.25% | 54.50% | 55.00% | 57.00% | 59.00% |
| **A2** | 53.80% | Data | 57.42% | 54.91% | 57.46% | 52.96% | NVR |
| **B1** | 2012 | Target>= | 68.00% | 70.00% | 73.00% | 75.00% | 79.00% |
| **B1** | 67.32% | Data | 65.46% | 65.23% | 63.34% | 58.33% | NVR |
| **B2** | 2012 | Target>= | 49.00% | 50.00% | 54.00% | 59.00% | 62.00% |
| **B2** | 46.20% | Data | 44.83% | 46.82% | 43.05% | 38.24% | NVR |
| **C1** | 2012 | Target>= | 70.00% | 71.50% | 73.00% | 74.00% | 75.00% |
| **C1** | 67.84% | Data | 69.29% | 71.85% | 69.72% | 64.81% | NVR |
| **C2** | 2012 | Target>= | 52.00% | 53.00% | 54.00% | 54.50% | 56.00% |
| **C2** | 48.87% | Data | 52.84% | 57.49% | 56.71% | 53.30% | NVR |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A1>= | 65.10% |
| Target A2>= | 54.00% |
| Target B1>= | 67.40% |
| Target B2>= | 54.00% |
| Target C1>= | 67.90% |
| Target C2>= | 48.90% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed**

579

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

| **Outcome A Progress Category** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 1 | 0.37% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 99 | 36.67% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 62 | 22.96% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 45 | 16.67% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 63 | 23.33% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 107 | 207 | NVR | 65.10% | 51.69% | Did Not Meet Target | N/A |
| 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 | 108 | 270 | NVR | 54.00% | 40.00% | Did Not Meet Target | N/A |

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

| **Outcome B Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 0 | 0.00% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 112 | 41.33% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 80 | 29.52% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 57 | 21.03% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 22 | 8.12% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 137 | 249 | NVR | 67.40% | 55.02% | Did Not Meet Target | N/A |
| 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 | 79 | 271 | NVR | 54.00% | 29.15% | Did Not Meet Target | N/A |

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

| **Outcome C Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 0 | 0.00% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 89 | 32.96% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 65 | 24.07% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 76 | 28.15% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 40 | 14.81% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 141 | 230 | NVR | 67.90% | 61.30% | Did Not Meet Target | N/A |
| 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 | 116 | 270 | NVR | 48.90% | 42.96% | Did Not Meet Target | N/A |

**The number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program**.

| **Question** | **Number** |
| --- | --- |
| 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 618 data | 933 |
| 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. | 266 |

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

YES

**List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.**

Alaska Part C collects all COS information from our early intervention agencies in Alaska's EI/ILP database.  
  
Alaska Part C's procedures for the COS require the initial rating to be completed within 3 months of enrollment or within 6 months of age, whichever is later. The exit rating is required to be completing within the 6-month window between 3-months prior to a child's exit date and 3-months following a child's exit date. The following domains are used to evaluate child outcomes upon entry and exit: adaptive, cognitive, expressive, fine motor, gross motor, receptive and social emotional. A variety of tools can be used to assess each outcome, and include but are not limited to: Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System (AEPS), Batelle Development Inventory (BDI), Bayley (BSID-III), Brigance Inventory of Early Development, Carolina Curriculum for Infants and Toddlers with Special Needs, Child Behavior Checklist, Child Development Inventory (CDI), Early Intervention Developmental Profile, Early Learning Accomplishment Profile (ELAP), Hawaii Early Learning Profile, Infant Toddler Developmental Assessment, Koontz Child Development Program, Oregon Project, Sewell Early Education Development Profile (SEED), Transdisciplinary Play Based Assessment, Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales and Walker Problem Behavior Identification Checklist.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

It is important to note that Alaska adjusted its targets for Indicators 3A, 3B and 3C and for both summary statements associated with each indicator. The modification of targets occurred after a semi-annual stakeholder meeting that had focused extensively on the COS and progress for ILP children throughout the state. After a review of the data, discussion with programs and an informational session with OSEP TAs, it was decided that the best course of action was for Alaska to modify it's targets to reflect the trending patterns within the COS. Since 2015, Alaska has seen downward trends for all outcomes, in spite of changing family demographics, populations and extensive staff training. A preliminary analysis completed in FFY18 revealed that the downward trends of child progress occurred throughout all regions of the states, and in 12 out of the 16 programs. It was clear that the targets for the COS, which had been set and remained unchanged for several years, needed to be adjusted. Targets were reset after an email survey was sent out to obtain thoughts on where the new targets would be set to, and Part C Staff agreed to continue their analysis of the downward trend in efforts to better understand the COS patterns that were occurring.  
  
Stakeholders and the Part C Office also discussed decreasing the baseline targets after a full evaluation of the trends could be completed at the end of FFY20. The decrease in targets for FFY19 reflect the stakeholders' desire to modify targets to better fit Alaska as it is currently; it is the hope that the lower targets and the proximity of progress from Part C Programs to those targets will help to better clarify the need to change baseline targets in the future.

## 3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2018. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2019 in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

A review of the Indicator 3 data was completed with OSEP in the summer of 2020. The review revealed that a data field had been left blank regarding the number of children who did not receive services for more than 6 months prior to exiting the Part C Program; that field has been re-evaluated, and data has been entered by the Part C Program. However, that data is still showing NVR as a year later; this finding was discussed with the EDEN Help Desk, and will continued to be monitored. Alaska has the data available and is able to provide it upon request, since it cannot be added to the eMaps system retroactively.  
  
In the current APR, the field that was left blank last year was not left blank, and has been adequately filled out.

## 3 - OSEP Response

The State revised its FFY 2019 targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 3 - Required Actions

# Indicator 4: Family Involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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)

**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.

**Instructions**

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 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.

## 4 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2006 | Target>= | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| A | 92.00% | Data | 94.44% | 94.03% | 89.86% | 91.57% | 91.78% |
| B | 2006 | Target>= | 96.75% | 97.00% | 97.25% | 97.50% | 98.00% |
| B | 97.00% | Data | 98.61% | 92.54% | 94.20% | 92.77% | 90.41% |
| C | 2006 | Target>= | 95.00% | 95.25% | 95.50% | 95.75% | 96.25% |
| C | 96.00% | Data | 97.18% | 92.54% | 95.65% | 95.18% | 90.41% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A>= | 100.00% |
| Target B>= | 98.00% |
| Target C>= | 96.25% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska Part C state staff met with numerous early childhood partners for soliciting broad stakeholder input throughout FFY19 and over the past year has continued outreach with these partners and sought their guidance when appropriate for the performance development of the Part C programs. These partners have included but are not limited to: the Early Intervention Committee (EIC/ICC), the Help Me Grow initiative and team, EIS providers, Alaska Early Learning Program Association board members, Department of Education and various staff and council members from various organizations such as the Alaska Early Childhood Coordinating Council, Alaska Association for Infant Mental Health and the Alaska Association for Education of Young Children. Soliciting stakeholder input took place through monthly meetings, teleconferences, state staff attending various council meetings and reflective discussions. Decisions regarding target setting for indicators took place semi-annually with stakeholders and members of the ICC and a survey was sent out to gather votes on specific targets, and setting appropriate numbers. Additionally, the Part C Office spoke at two separate meetings with stakeholder groups to discuss the SSIP, the ongoing progress of assessing Indicator 11, and steps the Part C Office was taking to follow the proposed timeline in the State Systemic Improvement Plan.

In a stakeholder meeting that took place at the end of FFY19, stakeholders did have a chance to inquire about the status of the Family Outcomes Survey and whether next year it would reflect the change from in-person services to virtual services. The Center for Human Development, the group that develops the survey and performs the outreach, agreed that a new question should be added to accommodate the change in service delivery related to the pandemic. The Part C Data Manager, utilizing feedback from stakeholders, worked with the CHD to create a question that would be added as an additional section to the FOS, which would be sent out spring of FFY20.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The number of families to whom surveys were distributed | 150 |
| Number of respondent families participating in Part C | 80 |
| A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 73 |
| A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 80 |
| 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 | 75 |
| B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | 80 |
| 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 | 72 |
| C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn | 80 |

| **Measure** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2) | 91.78% | 100.00% | 91.25% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2) | 90.41% | 98.00% | 93.75% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2) | 90.41% | 96.25% | 90.00% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | YES |
| If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? | NO |

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

A cross-sectional study design based within a randomized questionnaire was the methodology that Alaska continued to use to collect family outcomes data. Like last year, a third-evaluator, the University of Alaska Anchorage Center for Human Development (CHD) was contracted to create and implement the FY20 (FFY19) family outcomes survey. Chosen by both the State and CHD, it was decided to again send out surveys to 20% of all families involved with the Part C Program within all of Alaska. Families would be randomly selected through an algorithm process and once selected would receive multiple options for responding and follow-up, such as phone calls and reminder cards.   
  
Survey packets were mailed to target group families in March 18, 2020. To ensure a valid yield and reliable estimates, CHD used the following procedures:  
- There were eligibility requirements set in place for the responding group; these requirements were that a child within the family must have been enrolled during the previous calendar year, must have been eligible for Part C, and enrolled for at least 6 months. Families must have also had a valid mailing address on file.  
- To minimize undeliverable mail, the U.S. Post Office provided a service to check addresses and make corrections if newer information was entered in the USPS system.  
- For packets returned as undeliverable by April 14, the next highest random number within the same area/race category is used to identify a replacement family.   
- Families are offered several methods for survey submission: mail, online or by toll-free phone line. Follow-up is conducted within 2 weeks from the time the survey is mailed to families.  
- Post cards are sent as a reminder to non-responding families.  
- A deadline for survey response was set for April 30 and the survey closed on May 11; extra time was provided due to the ongoing pandemic.  
  
20% of eligible families resulted in 750 families for the 2019 sample. From the 750 families, after stratifying by geographic region and race of child, there were 150 families that received the surveys (this is an increase in families from FFY18). A 53% response rate was observed, with 80 completed surveys by the time the response period was over.

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a collection tool used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised collection tool? | NO |
| The demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program. | YES |

**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.**

The target group for the survey was randomly selected by stratifying the target group by geography and by race of children and assigning random numbers to all families in the eligible population. The data was sorted by 16 EI/ILP services areas and again by up to 6 race categories per area. Within each resulting area/race category the 20% with the highest random numbers were selected for the target group. Following trends from previous years, the largest proportions of children in EI/ILP services were identified as Alaska Native or American Indian ("Native") or White/Caucasian ("White"), with little representation on other races or ethnicity, despite growing representation among these groups within the Part C program. Children with any Native heritage are defined as Native for stratification purposes. This matches the culture in Alaska where people with partial Native heritage are recognized as members of Tribes or other indigenous groups. 31.5% of the children in the eligible population and 33.3% in the selected target group had Native heritage by this definition.  
  
  
A break down of the target group for participation based on race compared to the number of responders is as follows:  
- Alaska Native or American Indian: Target (33.3%) Responders (37.9%)  
- Asian: Target (6.3%) Responders (5.7%)  
- Black/African American: Target (5.0%) Responders (5.7%)  
- Pacific Islander: Target (1.3%), Responders (2.3%)  
- White/Caucasian: Target (60.4%) Responders (58.6%)  
- Hispanic or Latino: Target (10.1%) Responders (13.8%)  
  
Comparing racial response data to last year, Alaska has improved it's diversity and representativeness in responses in both the Black/African-American and Hispanic of Latino groups, showing the efforts made by the CHD survey to staff to expand outreach across all families of color. Although the CHD has done an admirable job of improving response rates among most racial groups, the lack of ability to have families report being biracial skews the data from the responses, and it is important to recognize this limitation.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2019 response data are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program , and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the population.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

## 4 - OSEP Response

## 4 - Required Actions

OSEP notes that one or more of the attachments included in the State’s FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education’s IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

# Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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)

**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 (E*MAPS*)) 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.

**Instructions**

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.

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 0.90% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 1.71% | 1.75% | 1.79% | 1.84% | 1.89% |
| Data | 1.83% | 1.91% | 1.88% | 1.71% | 1.71% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 1.89% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Alaska Part C state staff met with numerous early childhood partners for soliciting broad stakeholder input throughout FFY19 and over the past year has continued outreach with these partners and sought their guidance when appropriate for the performance development of the Part C programs. These partners have included but are not limited to: the Early Intervention Committee (EIC/ICC), the Help Me Grow initiative and team, EIS providers, Alaska Early Learning Program Association board members, Department of Education and various staff and council members from various organizations such as the Alaska Early Childhood Coordinating Council, Alaska Association for Infant Mental Health and the Alaska Association for Education of Young Children. Soliciting stakeholder input took place through monthly meetings, teleconferences, state staff attending various council meetings and reflective discussions. Decisions regarding target setting for indicators took place semi-annually with stakeholders and members of the ICC and a survey was sent out to gather votes on specific targets, and setting appropriate numbers. Additionally, the Part C Office spoke at two separate meetings with stakeholder groups to discuss the SSIP, the ongoing progress of assessing Indicator 11, and steps the Part C Office was taking to follow the proposed timeline in the State Systemic Improvement Plan.

The Alaska Part C team and the Alaska Early Intervention Council has reviewed and compared the birth rates, population growth and number of referrals over the last five years in June 2020. Alaska has been very invested in ensuring that all children, particularly from birth, are able to access the Infant Learning Program and its peripheral support services. With the guidance of the EIC and through collaboration with other early learning initiatives, the Part C team has worked to better improve collaboration with NICUs, pediatricians and parental groups across the state in regards to identifying children eligible for services; this effort began last year and has continued, despite interruptions from the pandemic. Stakeholders will continue to identify gaps in recruitment and referrals, and programs will continue to be creative in outreach and routes of communication with family and other groups, such as the Office of Children's Services and Help Me Grow.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/08/2020 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs | 173 |
| Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin | 06/25/2020 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 | 9,978 |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs** | **Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 173 | 9,978 | 1.71% | 1.89% | 1.73% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Compare your results to the national data**

The national average for child find from birth to 1-years old for FFY19 is 1.37%; Alaska's child find percentage is substantially above that threshold, at 1.73%. Despite more stringent eligibility requirements, Alaska continues to reach higher percentages of child find, and continues to work to improve visibility of Part C services, outreach to families who may qualify and access to programs.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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)

**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 (E*MAPS*)) 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.

**Instructions**

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 - Indicator Data

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 2.10% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 2.46% | 2.48% | 2.52% | 2.56% | 3.00% |
| Data | 2.24% | 2.59% | 2.64% | 2.66% | 2.66% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 2.70% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Alaska Part C state staff met with numerous early childhood partners for soliciting broad stakeholder input throughout FFY19 and over the past year has continued outreach with these partners and sought their guidance when appropriate for the performance development of the Part C programs. These partners have included but are not limited to: the Early Intervention Committee (EIC/ICC), the Help Me Grow initiative and team, EIS providers, Alaska Early Learning Program Association board members, Department of Education and various staff and council members from various organizations such as the Alaska Early Childhood Coordinating Council, Alaska Association for Infant Mental Health and the Alaska Association for Education of Young Children. Soliciting stakeholder input took place through monthly meetings, teleconferences, state staff attending various council meetings and reflective discussions. Decisions regarding target setting for indicators took place semi-annually with stakeholders and members of the ICC and a survey was sent out to gather votes on specific targets, and setting appropriate numbers. Additionally, the Part C Office spoke at two separate meetings with stakeholder groups to discuss the SSIP, the ongoing progress of assessing Indicator 11, and steps the Part C Office was taking to follow the proposed timeline in the State Systemic Improvement Plan.

The Alaska Part C team and the Alaska Early Intervention Council has reviewed and compared the birth rates, population growth and number of referrals over the last five years in June 2020. Alaska has been very invested in ensuring that all children, particularly from birth, are able to access the Infant Learning Program and its peripheral support services. With the guidance of the EIC and through collaboration with other early learning initiatives, the Part C team has worked to better improve collaboration with NICUs, pediatricians and parental groups across the state in regards to identifying children eligible for services; this effort began last year and has continued, despite interruptions from the pandemic. Stakeholders will continue to identify gaps in recruitment and referrals, and programs will continue to be creative in outreach and routes of communication with family and other groups, such as the Office of Children's Services and Help Me Grow. Alaska exceeded its target for this year in this particular indicator, and stakeholders will re-convene to establish whether the target needs to be reset, or maintained.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/08/2020 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs | 923 |
| Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin | 06/25/2020 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 | 30,176 |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs** | **Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 923 | 30,176 | 2.66% | 2.70% | 3.06% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Compare your results to the national data**

The national average for child find from birth to 3-years old for FFY19 is 3.40%; Alaska's child find percentage is less than that threshold, at 3.06%. However, considering Alaska's more restrictive enrollment criteria and lower population compared to other states, it is plausible to have a lower percentage of qualifying infants and toddlers compared to the national average.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

## 6 - Required Actions

# Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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)

**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.

**Instructions**

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, 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 88.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 99.89% | 99.89% | 99.68% | 99.89% | 99.81% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 626 | 918 | 99.81% | 100% | 99.67% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**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" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.**
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**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

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).**

July 1, 2019 - June 30, 2020

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

This data represents all eligible Part C children for the reporting period of July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020. Alaska Part C uses a statewide data system that calculates initial non-compliance based on the actual number of days from the time a referral was received to the time an initial IFSP meeting occurred. The data reflects all newly referred and enrolled children in the reporting period. Contact records are compared with the ILP database to ensure enrollment for eligible children is timely and compliant. This data is reviewed and verified by agencies and State Technical Assistants on a quarterly basis for timeliness and accuracy. Agencies self-monitor and plan improvement activities to correct non-compliance on an ongoing basis. State technical assistance is provided when correction is not demonstrated the following quarter.  
  
In addition, the ILP database includes automated data checks and management reports for EIS agencies and Part C State Staff. These reports includes automated data cleaning and reminders reports for EIS agencies and Part C State Staff to ensure there are no missing or inaccurate data. Annual desk audits are completed by the Part C Data Manager and record reviews are conducted by Part C Program Specialists to further ensure data accuracy. Any non-compliance identified during any of our monitoring activities must be completed within 12 months of issuance of the finding.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

It should be noted that there were 124 non-compliances classified as "exceptional family circumstances" that were related to the COVID-19 pandemic. Contacting families and setting up evaluation times and meetings with families were often pushed out, or stopped due to families deciding to delay services until they were in-person, or due to complications regarding being able to communicate with the family through a virtual means.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Prior to considering the findings of noncompliance from FFY 2018 corrected, the Alaska Part C Office verified that the 2 regional sites with incidents of noncompliance were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements specific to the timeliness of an initial evaluation. Specifically, the Part C Office reviewed subsequent updated data from the state-wide database, quarterly compliance reports and program self-assessments. After pulling additional data in the following quarter to assess program compliance after the findings were issued to the programs, it was found that both programs had reached 100% compliance. With this finding, the programs were identified as having suitably addressed their non-compliance for Indicator 7 and no further findings or corrective actions were issued.

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

The Alaska Part C Office verified through child record and data review that the 2 individual cases of noncompliance across 2 regional sites which occurred in FFY 2018 had been corrected. Both of the children that had not completed an evaluation in a timely manner were found to have received an evaluation, although outside of the appropriate timeline.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

## 7 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

# Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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)

**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 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.

**Instructions**

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 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 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 94.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 99.53% | 100.00% | 99.89% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 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)**

YES

| **Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 672 | 987 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**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” field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.**
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**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

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).**

July 1, 2019 - June 30, 2020

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

This data represents all eligible Part C children for this reporting period; the data counts all infants and toddlers 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 during the reporting period. Contact records are compared with the ILP database to ensure transition plans for eligible children are timely and compliant. This data is reviewed and verified by early intervention agencies quarterly for timeliness and accuracy. Early intervention agencies self-monitor and plan improvement activities to correct non-compliance. State Technical Assistance is provided when clarification is required on any quarterly reporting.  
  
The EI/ILP data system includes automated data checks and management reports for early intervention agencies and state staff to ensure there are no missing data fields, dates out of expected range; data drop down fields are used for SPP/APR reporting requirements. Annual desk audits are completed by the Part C Data Manager and onsite record reviews are completed during monitoring visits and by State Program Specialists during technical assistance site visits to further ensure data accuracy. Technical Assistance is designed based on Early intervention local needs and statewide data trends in addition to agency specific needs. All non-compliance must be corrected within 12 months of finding by the agency where the non-compliance was identified. It is important to note that exceptional family circumstances included children with late referrals (less than 90 days to child's third birthday) to Alaska Part C.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Because Alaska is at 100% (outside of those delays attributed to family circumstances), there were no delays in children exiting the program receiving an IFSP with transition steps and services. However, it is important to note that COVID-19 did have an impact on families and the delays attributed to exceptional family circumstances. COVID-19 impacted the timeliness of transitions among children who exited the program, since meetings were often delayed to technical issues (as everything was completed virtually), difficulties communicating with families related to technology and setting up times to meet when families were navigating balancing school and working from home.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **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 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 8A - Prior FFY Required Actions

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

## 8A - OSEP Response

## 8A - Required Actions

# Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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)

**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 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.

**Instructions**

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 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 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8B - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 86.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 82.71% | 99.81% | 100.00% | 97.52% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA**

YES

| **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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 318 | 368 | 97.52% | 100% | 98.76% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**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" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.**
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**Describe the method used to collect these data**

Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), Alaska has adopted 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 Alaska includes in the calculation under 8B, 46 children for whom the parents have opted out. Alaska's written opt-out policy is on file with the Department as part of the State’s Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).  
  
The SEA notification data represent automated notification from the Part C data system to a shared secure server for all toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for those toddlers eligible for Part B services. Alaska Part B can access this data which is updated weekly as Part C children turn 27 months of age unless a parent opts out of notification. SEA notification target and data are 100% for SEA notification.  
  
The Part C data system creates an individualized notification letter for any child transitioning to Part B. Local EIS providers print and send the child notification letter to the LEA for each potentially Part B eligible toddler exiting Part C unless the parent opted out. Each EIS agency now verifies date notification was sent and LEA receipt at the individual child level in the statewide EI/ILP database. Alaska Part C and Part B initiated a new agreement for LEA monitoring in FFY15 to include all children for the fiscal year. Alaska Part C reported NVR data for FFY13 due to this system and staffing change. Current data indicates this system is fully functioning.  
  
Alaska Part C LEA notification compliance is monitored through the Alaska Part C Monitoring/General Supervision System; each early intervention agencies is required to document LEA notification for each child in the Alaska Part C database. This data should match the referrals sent to the Part B office. Quarterly meetings are held to verify that the referrals match, although further efforts are being made to continually monitor and improve the communication between Part B and Part C.

**Do you have a written opt-out policy? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, is the policy on file with the Department? (yes/no)**

YES

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

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).**

July 1, 2019 - June 30, 2020

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

Alaska Part C accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers for the full reporting period with SEA and LEA notification. Alaska Part C SEA and LEA data is collected and monitored through its statewide data system, and then compared with notification data obtained from the Part B Office.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

As seen in Indicator 3A, the COVID-19 pandemic did affect transitions for Part C families. In terms of notifying the school district, many programs did see delays and issues arise with trying to send notifications and ensure that they were sent in a timely manner. The school district closed in FY20 Q3 (mid-March) and remained closed into FY21, which impacted programs' ability to communicate effectively with the school district and guarantee that notifications had been received and were going to be put into action.  
  
Additionally, many families were not keen to make a decision about enrolling in Part B services since the status of school was unknown at the end of FY20. Programs received feedback that families would have liked to participate in Part B if there was going to be in-person school, but with the uncertainty, many families chose to withdraw from Part C services early, and requested to not be referred to Part B. This is evident in the smaller number of transitions among those with Part B eligibility.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Prior to considering the findings of noncompliance from FFY 2018 corrected, the Alaska Part C Office verified that the 6 regional sites with incidents of noncompliance were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements specific to the timely notification of SEA and LEA agencies. Specifically, the Part C Office reviewed subsequent updated data from the state-wide database, quarterly compliance reports and program self-assessments. After pulling additional data in the following quarter to assess program compliance after the findings were issued to the programs, it was found that all 6 programs had reached 100% compliance. With this finding, the programs were identified as having suitably addressed their non-compliance for Indicator 8B and no further findings or corrective actions were issued.

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

The Alaska Part C Office verified through child record and data review that the 10 individual cases of noncompliance across 6 regional sites which occurred in FFY 2018 had been corrected. All of the infants and toddlers affected by a late notification to the LEA/SEA did have notifications sent to their respective school districts, although late.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 8B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8B - OSEP Response

## 8B - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

# Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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)

**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 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.

**Instructions**

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 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 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8C - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 85.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 99.82% | 99.81% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 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)**

YES

| **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred 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** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 300 | 368 | 100.00% | 100% | 99.73% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**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" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.**

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 not more than nine months prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.**
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**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

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).**

July 1, 2019 - June 30, 2020

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

This data represents all eligible Part C children that exited the program during the reporting period that were potentially eligible for Part B services. It is important to note that children who exited due to having a status of deceased, moved, out of contact or parent withdrawal were not included in the denominator because they were not evaluated for Part B eligibility. From the eligible pool of exiting children, the data counts all infants and toddlers 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 reaching their third birthday during the reporting period. Contact records are compared with the EI/ILP database to ensure transition conferences for eligible children are timely and compliant. This data is reviewed and verified by early intervention agencies quarterly for timeliness and accuracy. State Technical Assistance is provided when correction is not demonstrated the following quarter. This data represents all eligible Part C children for this reporting period.  
  
The EI/ILP data system includes automated data checks and management reports for early intervention and state staff to ensure there are no missing data fields or dates out of expected range. Data drop down fields are used for SPP/APR reporting requirements. Annual desk audits are completed by the Part C Data Manager and Part C Program Specialists. Onsite record reviews are completed during monitoring visits and during technical assistance site visits by Part C Program Specialists to ensure data accuracy. Technical Assistance is designed based on early intervention local needs and statewide data trends. All non-compliance must be corrected as soon as possible, but no later than 12 months following the issuance of a finding.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The COVID-19 pandemic affected programs' abilities to meet with families, because families often wanted to transition out of services when they learned the services would be virtual only; additionally, several families opted out of the transition process entirely because they did not want to participate in virtual services. As with other indicators, reaching families who did not have access to technology during the pandemic, also made it difficult to schedule transition conferences in a timely manner. Under OSEP guidance, these instances were justifiable under "exceptional family circumstances."  
  
One instance of non-compliance was identified at a program where there was no justification for having a transition conference occur 1 day late outside of the window. The State TA reached out to the program to review contacts and notes for the case, and it was revealed that the delay was the fault of the program's, and unrelated to an exceptional family circumstance.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **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 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 8C - Prior FFY Required Actions

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

## 8C - OSEP Response

## 8C - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

# Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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)

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

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.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

YES

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.**

Resolution is not part of the requirements or options provided by the Part C Office in Alaska, and therefore this indicator is not applicable.

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

This Indicator is not applicable to the State.

## 9 - Required Actions

# Indicator 10: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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)

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = ((2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

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 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.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1 Mediations held | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 0 |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Alaska Part C state staff met with numerous early childhood partners for soliciting broad stakeholder input throughout FFY19 and over the past year has continued outreach with these partners and sought their guidance when appropriate for the performance development of the Part C programs. These partners have included but are not limited to: the Early Intervention Committee (EIC/ICC), the Help Me Grow initiative and team, EIS providers, Alaska Early Learning Program Association board members, Department of Education and various staff and council members from various organizations such as the Alaska Early Childhood Coordinating Council, Alaska Association for Infant Mental Health and the Alaska Association for Education of Young Children. Soliciting stakeholder input took place through monthly meetings, teleconferences, state staff attending various council meetings and reflective discussions. Decisions regarding target setting for indicators took place semi-annually with stakeholders and members of the ICC and a survey was sent out to gather votes on specific targets, and setting appropriate numbers. Additionally, the Part C Office spoke at two separate meetings with stakeholder groups to discuss the SSIP, the ongoing progress of assessing Indicator 11, and steps the Part C Office was taking to follow the proposed timeline in the State Systemic Improvement Plan.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target>= |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target>= |  |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints** | **2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints** | **2.1 Number of mediations held** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2019. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

## 10 - Required Actions

# Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan



# Certification

**Instructions**

**Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.**

**Certify**

**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.**

**Select the certifier’s role**

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:**

Anthony Newman

**Title:**

Deputy Director, Alaska Division of Senior and Disabilities Services

**Email:**

anthony.newman@alaska.gov

**Phone:**

907-465-5481

**Submitted on:**

04/26/21 6:58:14 PM

# ED Attachments

**  **