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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**

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.**

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.  
Monitoring:  
The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C system in Nebraska, known as the Early Development Network (EDN), is co-administered by the Nebraska Department of Education (NDE), Office of Special Education and the Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services (NDHHS), Division of Medicaid and Long-term Care (aka “Co-Lead Agencies” or “the Co-Leads”). Per the Nebraska Early Intervention Act, these 2 agencies are responsible for the planning, implementation, and administration of the federal Early Intervention Services System and the Nebraska Early Intervention Act. Additionally, the Nebraska Early Intervention Act requires interagency Planning Region Teams (PRTs) to be responsible for assisting in the planning and implementation of the Early Intervention Act in each local community or region. The IDEA Part C regulations require the Nebraska Part C Co-Lead Agencies to monitor local Early Intervention Programs on the implementation of early intervention regulations outlined in NDE 92 NAC 52 (Rule 52) and NDHHS 480 NAC 1. Each of the PRTs is an interagency coordinating council made up of local schools, health and human service agencies, community agencies, Head Start, families, and others who provide early intervention services. Each PRT covers a specific geographic area of the state and is responsible for implementation of an interagency system of services in the region. The EDN Services Coordination agency within the PRT assumes the responsibility for delivery of the entitlement of services coordination in the region. The EDN Services Coordination agency may be the same agency selected by the PRT as the lead agency, but in many cases, these are two separate agencies working collaboratively to provide early intervention services in the region. The Nebraska Part C Co-Lead Monitoring process gathers data from multiple sources, analyzes results, identifies gaps with Part C services, rates PRT performance, and stimulates the development of improvement activities for the PRT. The monitoring process relies on multiple sources of data to gauge the effectiveness of early intervention supports and services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. Nebraska has developed monitoring procedures which require PRT’s to be reviewed at least once every three (3) years for implementation of the requirements under Part C of IDEA. The Nebraska Part C Co-Lead Agencies review a variety of data sources to document each PRT’s compliance with NDE 92 NAC 52 (Rule 52) and NDHHS 480 NAC 1, including:  
1. IFSP File Review  
2. Completion of prior Corrective Action Plans;  
3. Policies and Procedures Review;  
4. Forms Review;  
5. Review of results from mediations, complaint and due process reports; and  
6. Review of supporting data from sources such as PRT child count, Referral vs. Verification Data, Referral Sources, CAPTA, and Performance Reports for the last 3 years.  
The steps in the monitoring process include:  
Step One: The Part C Co-Leads schedule the monitoring plan for the upcoming year. The monitoring team is composed of the Part C Co-Coordinators and additional NDE and NDHHS staff to assist in the Monitoring  
process. The PRT Lead Agency receives the Notification letter informing the PRT of the scheduled date of the upcoming Part C Monitoring.  
The Part C Monitoring Team meets with the PRT members to discuss the various components of the monitoring process, including IFSP file reviews, correction of noncompliance, verification of correction of noncompliance,  
how information generated from the monitoring activities will be incorporated into the Corrective Action Plan (CAP) and PRT Improvement planning process to improve results for infants/toddlers with disabilities and their  
families.  
Step Two: The Part C Monitoring Team reviews the PRT’s early intervention process, including the following components:  
· Forms used by the PRT to document the implementation of 92 NAC 52 and 480 NAC 1  
· IFSP Files  
· PRT Policies, Procedures and Practices  
· Review of any complaints filed and investigated by the Co-Lead Agencies pursuant to 92 NAC 52 and 480 NAC 1  
· Review of any due process findings issued pursuant to 92 NAC 55  
· Review of the timely correction of any noncompliance identified during the previous monitoring cycle  
· Issues identified as part of previous fiscal review or sub-recipient fiscal reviews  
Step Three: The Part C Monitoring Team conducts the Focused Onsite PRT Exit Conference. The result of the PRT monitoring is shared with the PRT members. This visit allows an opportunity for clarification or  
submission of evidence to determine whether or not compliance was met.  
Step Four: The Part C Co-Leads provide written notification of Findings to the PRT. The PRT must submit a CAP within 45 days to the Part C Co-Leads. Upon submission of the PRT’s CAP, the Part C Co-Leads will give  
approval in writing.  
Step Five: Verification of Correction of Noncompliance and Closeout of Monitoring Process. Pursuant to 92 NAC 52-004.02E, all noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible, and in no case later than one year from the date on which the PRT is notified of a finding of noncompliance. For all individual instances of noncompliance that can be corrected, the PRT must immediately correct and submit evidence of correction to the Part C Co-Leads, who will document the receipt of evidence of the individual correction. The Closeout Letter will be completed by Part C Co-Leads following the completion of the verification activities and the final report. This Closeout Letter is a clear statement by the Part C Co-Leads that the PRT has corrected the areas of noncompliance previously identified, has successfully completed the CAP, and the PRT is now in full compliance with IDEA Part C Regulations, NDE 92 NAC 52, and NDHHS 480 NAC 1.  
Dispute Resolution:  
Complaints  
The NDE Complaint Investigator will complete the complaint process as identified in 92 NAC 51-009.11, meeting the appropriate timelines. All correspondence to the complainants is completed by the Complaint Investigator. If any noncompliance is identified, the agency will be contacted and required to complete a CAP, and the Complaint Investigator will send the Closeout Letter.  
Due Process Hearings-  
The NDE Legal Office provides guidance to Parents, etc., on completing the Dispute Resolution element of the due process hearing in accordance with 92 NAC 51-009.13. Other mediation requests are handled through the regional Mediation Centers, in accordance with 92 NAC 51-009.12.  
Mediation-  
Mediation is an integral part of the complaint and due process procedures. There are six (6) Mediation Centers located regionally throughout the State of Nebraska to provide services to parents, families and school districts.  
Provision of a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE)  
Since Nebraska is a Birth-mandate state, the Nebraska Department of Education, Office of Special Education works with school districts, service agencies and approved cooperatives to ensure that all infants and toddlers with disabilities in the State of Nebraska are receiving a free, appropriate public education (FAPE) in their natural environment to the maximum extent appropriate.  
Timely and Accurate Reporting of Data:  
The Nebraska Department of Education, Office of Special Education works with PRTs, school districts, service agencies and approved cooperatives to ensure that all data requirements are met in reporting the data. “Deadlines are Deadlines” is the rule for reporting data on time, and ensuring that the data is accurate and not needing to be returned for further review and revision.

**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.**

Nebraska has spent considerable energy building an “internal” support structure—necessary if we are to move innovative practices and programs from initial training to full implementation. This effort began sincerely in 2009 when two Nebraska practitioners attended the Siskin National Routines-Based Interview (RBI) training institute in Chattanooga, TN to become nationally certified interviewers. Building infrastructure from the top down, the Part C Co-Lead Coordinators and the Part B 619 Coordinator, along with the two newly certified RBI trainers formed a State level implementation team. Using the RBI as the first of Nebraska’s “usable interventions”, the state began to pilot a statewide implementation plan of training and TA for the RBI as well as additional evidence-based practices. An additional sixteen service providers and services coordinators attended the RBI Siskin Institute with the intent of strategically placing certified RBI trainers geographically across the state. Additional training opportunities provided by the Co-Leads addressed evidence-based practices directly impacted by use of the RBI, e.g. Quality Home Visits, Integrated Service Delivery, and Collaborative Consultation with Childcare. Professional development opportunities and TA have been facilitated using the Nebraska Team Self-Assessment. The tool, “Implementing Evidence-Based Practices in Natural and Inclusive Environments for Children Birth to 3,” was adapted from the original work of Robin McWilliam. The statewide coordinators provide TA to support the work of these teams through biannual conference calls and assistance. Because use of the RBI impacts the overall EI process, the focus of the stakeholder groups and our professional development/TA expanded to include evidence-based practices beyond child and family assessment. Using the implementation science research, the state leadership team developed an implementation plan aimed at implementing all three RDA improvement strategies statewide and creating sustainability. The statewide coordinators biannual conference calls and provision of additional TA opportunities has allowed for the development of an RBI statewide fidelity process, monitoring of functional child and family IFSP outcomes, and implementation of routines-based home visits, as well as PRT specific planning for ongoing training and TA. Webinars have been developed to provide an overview of the RDA/SSIP, strengthen the use of the RBI, provide functional outcome guidance, and introduce routines-based home visits using the Getting Ready approach. The Regional RBEI TA implements data-driven professional development and TA within each assigned PRT. Evaluation procedures for the implementation of the RBI, functional child and family IFSP outcomes and routines-based quality home visits are continuously implemented. The results are used to adjust training and TA for the cohort PRT’s, as well as statewide.  
Nebraska utilizes Teaching Strategies GOLD to collect federal child outcome data. Currently, multiple levels of training on the TS Gold system for early intervention providers and administrators are offered virtually and in multiple locations across the state to provide access for staff. The Early Development Network website provides on-demand TA access for service providers, administrators, services coordinators, planning region teams and families related to regulations, guidelines, RDA/SSIP, evidence-based practices, examples and samples from local PRTs, and training announcements. The site also connects to on-line training modules addressing foundational EI topics, including "Orientation to the Early Development Network in Nebraska," "Home Visitation Core Principles and Practices", and a web-based IFSP development training. In addition, the Co-Leads provide TA by request through meetings, trainings, conference calls, and webinars. The Co-leads conduct a conference every other year which provides a forum for training on the Part C regulations and offers technical assistance guidance on various topics. Also, the Co-Leads continue to provide targeted training/TA as a result of needs identified via the monitoring process.

**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.**

For several years, the Nebraska Part C Co-Leads -- Department of Education (NDE) and the Department of Health and Human Services (NDHHS), have provided significant professional development and technical assistance (TA) consistent with evidence-based research in early intervention and the mission, beliefs, and principles promoted by the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTAC). Intensive statewide training has focused on the provision of services in natural environments, use of the Primary Service Provider service delivery model, and coaching and teaming practices. The Co-Leads added training and implementation in the use of the Routines Based Interview (RBI) as a child and family assessment process; writing functional and meaningful child and family outcomes; and, provision of quality home visits through the Getting Ready Approach in order to meet RDA/SSIP requirements. The RBI is an assessment tool that uses the research about how young children learn, i.e. through natural learning opportunities within their family, to facilitate family engagement toward improving child and family outcomes. These training initiatives were provided by Dr. Robin McWilliam of the Siskin Institute in TN, Dathan Rush and M’Lisa Shelden of the Family Infant Preschool Program in NC, and Dr. Lisa Knoche of the Center for Research on Children, Youth, Families and Schools at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln -- national researchers and presenters on evidence-based practices in early intervention. Although many of our state’s efforts are now primarily related to the RDA work, Nebraska has additional ongoing training efforts that peripherally impact the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). These training efforts include: Special Care which focuses on child care providers who care for children with disabilities; Early Learning Guidelines trainings which provide information about developmentally appropriate practices across domains in inclusive settings; Early Childhood Multi-tiered Systems of Support and Pyramid; CAPTA-related trainings to child welfare, court, and EI personnel; and Circle of Security training – all of which are supported through collaboration with multiple state and private agencies - Nebraska Children and Families Foundation, Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services, Nebraska Head Start State Collaboration Office, University of Nebraska’s Center for Children, Families and the Law, University of Nebraska’s Munroe Meyer Institute, Higher Education partners at the University of Nebraska Lincoln and Omaha, and the Nebraska Infant Mental Health Association. The Parent Training & Information Center (PTI) is a family partner to the EDN Co-Leads and provides numerous training activities for families, services coordinators and service providers. Family representatives have the opportunity to influence training and TA activities both at the state and local levels by participating in planning sessions and through the provision of feedback. Several trainings are offered to families via PTI and partner agencies, funded by the EDN Co-Leads.

**Broad Stakeholder Input:**

**The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State’s 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’s Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

Stakeholder Involvement: Nebraska regularly seeks input from stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation or implementation strategies. Specific to the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report, Nebraska has established a broad based stakeholder group. The group includes representatives of parents, school district Directors of Special Education, special education staff, early childhood programs, Routines Based Early Intervention (RBEI) technical assistants, higher education, services coordination, Head Start, Health and Human Services, community agencies, early intervention service providers, court system, psychologists, early childhood special education, and the medical field.  
This group has met periodically throughout the past year and will continue meeting to establish/review targets and performance as indicated in the SPP/APR and the development and implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Thus far the Stakeholders have reviewed historical data around each of the indicators and established targets for each of the indicators. Additionally, the Stakeholders assisted the Co-leads in establishing the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). Stakeholders provided guidance and input on activities and evaluation measures of the SSIP.  
In addition to the Stakeholder group established specifically for the purpose of gathering input on the SSIP and SPP/APR, Nebraska also obtains input from the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) and the Early Childhood Interagency Coordinating Council (ECICC). These Councils are established pursuant to 34 CFR 300.167 and 34 CFR 303.600 and as such provide for input from a diverse group of stakeholders. The Councils regularly discuss the SPP/APR and provide input on the targets and strategies contained therein. SEAC and ECICC will continue to be utilized for input on the development of the SSIP and the SIMR.  
In 2021, the EDN co-leads engaged in several activities to recruit new and diverse parents to our stakeholder groups. We solicited local early intervention programs with historically underserved populations to find diverse parents.   
Please see the Parent Members Engagement section for additional information.

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

YES

**Number of Parent Members:**

15

**Parent Members Engagement:**

**Describe how the parent members of the Interagency Coordinating Council, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

In October and November of 2021, the Co-Leads engaged in two virtual stakeholder meetings due to the COVID 19 pandemic as well as to accommodate families’ schedules. In advance of these meetings, we engaged in several activities to ensure the parent voice was appropriately captured. The EDN co-leads participated in active parent recruitment with all 28 local early intervention programs. We additionally targeted local programs with higher numbers of historically underserved populations to ensure a diverse parent stakeholder make up. Personal contacts and invitations were made with all new parent recruits including ICC parent members. Parents were offered stipends to assist with lost wages and child care to ensure participation. The co-leads also engaged with PTI Nebraska and the University of Nebraska Monroe Meyer Institute, a disability advocacy center, to cohost and facilitate an orientation meeting with the stakeholder parents one week prior to the meeting to provide an overview of the SSIP and SPP-APR to ensure the parents had the appropriate context and information needed to actively participate. All stakeholders were provided copies of the meeting materials in advance of the meeting to give them time to review the data, evaluation progress, proposed targets, and improvement strategies. During the stakeholder meetings engagement strategies included participants' ability to share their input via audio or chat box. Additionally, input was solicited via open discussion and polls.

**Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:**

**Describe the activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.**

The Early Development Network (EDN) values family input and families sharing their experiences to improve and prioritize activities in our state. As partners to the EDN, the UNMC Munroe-Meyer Institute and PTI-Nebraska conducted two meetings where stakeholder parents could learn more about the stakeholder process, network with other families, and receive additional information in order to fully participate in the stakeholder meetings. PTI and advocacy center staff supported parents during and after the meetings to answer questions and provide assistance around the stakeholder process in order to improve parent capacity and boost parent engagement in the development of activities designed to improve outcomes for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. Finally, the co-leads sent a personal thank you message to each of the parent stakeholders for their assistance and guidance.

**Soliciting Public Input:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

In 2021, the co-leads engaged in multiple forums to solicit public input for setting targets, analyzing data, and developing improvement strategies. The co-leads performed these activities with Nebraska’s Part C ICC and Part C RDA stakeholder members. Additionally, monthly Special Education/Early Intervention webinars were held in which information was provided and input was solicited around this activity. The co-leads also engaged in Nebraska’s Results Matter Taskforce which consisted of EI administrators, practioners, and collaborative partners to solicit input for target setting, development of improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. In efforts to recruit and solicit public input the coleads added a feature on the EDN website that enabled the public to join the RDA stakeholder process. This link can be viewed here: https://edn.ne.gov/cms/rda-stakeholders-group

**Making Results Available to the Public:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.**

The stakeholder meeting materials are posted annually in the fall and archived on the EDN website. These materials can be viewed at the following link: https://edn.ne.gov/cms/rda-stakeholder-meetings. Additionally our SSIP is annually reported on the EDN website at this link: https://edn.ne.gov/cms/state-systemic-improvement-plans-ssip

**Reporting to the Public:**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 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 2019 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 2019 APR in 2021, is available.**

Planning Region Team performance on each of the APR indicators is reported each spring on the Early Development Network website. The report can be found at, http://edn.ne.gov/spp/regional-data.html. The Early Development Network website is a site that provides information to the public, families, service providers and the Planning Region Teams on the Early Intervention program in Nebraska. A copy of the state's SPP is located on the EDN site, http://edn.ne.gov/cms/public-reporting-0.

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), 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 | 99.43% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 98.55% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 97.16% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 113 | 113 | 97.16% | 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.***

0

**Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.**

**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).**

Nebraska's criteria for timely receipt of early intervention services is as soon as possible after the parent consents in writing to the service but not later  
than 30 days of receipt of parental consent.

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

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.**

The Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) and Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services (NDHHS), acting as co-lead agencies (the CoLeads), are responsible for ensuring Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is fully implemented for all infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families through the Early Development Network (EDN). The Part C Co-leads monitor the state's Planning Region Teams (PRTs) on  
a three year cycle. IFSP files and other records maintained by Services Coordinators are reviewed for compliance with IDEA and Medicaid. The Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) checklist file review for Improving Learning for Children with Disabilities (ILCD) gathers data regarding the receipt of early intervention services on IFSPs in a timely manner. In FFY 2020, 9 of the Planning Regions participated in an IFSP file review for a total of 113 files. All 113 files (100%) were in compliance with the IFSP services provided in a timely manner.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The Co-Leads notified each EIS program in writing concerning the finding of noncompliance and the requirement that the noncompliance be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year from identification. The State verified that each EIS program not in compliance, correctly implemented the specific regulatory requirement and ensured that all children received the services listed on the IFSP in a timely manner. Each EIS program was required to develop and implement a Corrective Action Plan to ensure correction of noncompliance within one year. The Co-Leads monitored the implementation of the Corrective Action Plan. In addition, the Co-Leads reviewed files of newly-referred children for assurance that compliance was met and the CAP-related processes, as well as specific regulatory requirements, were implemented. Within one year of identification each EIS program was found to be in 100% compliance in meeting the Timely Services requirement.

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

Each EIS program was required to develop and implement a Corrective Action Plan to ensure correction of noncompliance within one year. The Co-Leads monitored the implementation of the Corrective Action Plan. The State ensured that each child received all IFSP services, although late in some instances, as noted in the FFY 2019 APR. In addition, the Co-Leads reviewed files of newly-referred children for assurance that compliance was met and the CAP-related processes, as well as specific regulatory requirements, were implemented. Within one year of identification each EIS program was found to be in 100% compliance in meeting the Timely Services requirement.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 1 - Prior FFY 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.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

FFY 2019 findings of noncompliance verified as corrected is addressed within Indicator 1 as required by the template. Please reference Indicator 1.

## 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 ED*Facts* 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 | 91.03% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target>= | 97.00% | 97.50% | 98.00% | 98.20% | 98.20% |
| Data | 98.27% | 98.98% | 99.49% | 99.24% | 99.15% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= | 93.00% | 93.50% | 94.00% | 94.50% | 95.00% | 95.50% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholder Involvement: Nebraska regularly seeks input from stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation or implementation strategies. Specific to the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report, Nebraska has established a broad based stakeholder group. The group includes representatives of parents, school district Directors of Special Education, special education staff, early childhood programs, Routines Based Early Intervention (RBEI) technical assistants, higher education, services coordination, Head Start, Health and Human Services, community agencies, early intervention service providers, court system, psychologists, early childhood special education, and the medical field.  
This group has met periodically throughout the past year and will continue meeting to establish/review targets and performance as indicated in the SPP/APR and the development and implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Thus far the Stakeholders have reviewed historical data around each of the indicators and established targets for each of the indicators. Additionally, the Stakeholders assisted the Co-leads in establishing the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). Stakeholders provided guidance and input on activities and evaluation measures of the SSIP.  
In addition to the Stakeholder group established specifically for the purpose of gathering input on the SSIP and SPP/APR, Nebraska also obtains input from the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) and the Early Childhood Interagency Coordinating Council (ECICC). These Councils are established pursuant to 34 CFR 300.167 and 34 CFR 303.600 and as such provide for input from a diverse group of stakeholders. The Councils regularly discuss the SPP/APR and provide input on the targets and strategies contained therein. SEAC and ECICC will continue to be utilized for input on the development of the SSIP and the SIMR.  
In 2021, the EDN co-leads engaged in several activities to recruit new and diverse parents to our stakeholder groups. We solicited local early intervention programs with historically underserved populations to find diverse parents.   
Please see the Parent Members Engagement section for additional information.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age | 07/08/2021 | Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings | 1,823 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age | 07/08/2021 | Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs | 1,895 |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,823 | 1,895 | 99.15% | 93.00% | 96.20% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 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**

Stakeholder Involvement: Nebraska regularly seeks input from stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation or implementation strategies. Specific to the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report, Nebraska has established a broad based stakeholder group. The group includes representatives of parents, school district Directors of Special Education, special education staff, early childhood programs, Routines Based Early Intervention (RBEI) technical assistants, higher education, services coordination, Head Start, Health and Human Services, community agencies, early intervention service providers, court system, psychologists, early childhood special education, and the medical field.  
This group has met periodically throughout the past year and will continue meeting to establish/review targets and performance as indicated in the SPP/APR and the development and implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Thus far the Stakeholders have reviewed historical data around each of the indicators and established targets for each of the indicators. Additionally, the Stakeholders assisted the Co-leads in establishing the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). Stakeholders provided guidance and input on activities and evaluation measures of the SSIP.  
In addition to the Stakeholder group established specifically for the purpose of gathering input on the SSIP and SPP/APR, Nebraska also obtains input from the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) and the Early Childhood Interagency Coordinating Council (ECICC). These Councils are established pursuant to 34 CFR 300.167 and 34 CFR 303.600 and as such provide for input from a diverse group of stakeholders. The Councils regularly discuss the SPP/APR and provide input on the targets and strategies contained therein. SEAC and ECICC will continue to be utilized for input on the development of the SSIP and the SIMR.  
In 2021, the EDN co-leads engaged in several activities to recruit new and diverse parents to our stakeholder groups. We solicited local early intervention programs with historically underserved populations to find diverse parents.   
Please see the Parent Members Engagement section for additional information.

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| **A1** | 2020 | Target>= | 40.00% | 40.50% | 41.00% | 41.50% | 41.50% |
| **A1** | 59.30% | Data | 53.77% | 55.68% | 44.28% | 39.34% | 57.51% |
| **A2** | 2020 | Target>= | 44.50% | 45.50% | 46.00% | 47.00% | 47.00% |
| **A2** | 51.34% | Data | 27.91% | 29.45% | 29.51% | 25.15% | 50.14% |
| **B1** | 2020 | Target>= | 40.50% | 41.00% | 41.50% | 42.50% | 42.50% |
| **B1** | 58.58% | Data | 46.09% | 45.22% | 39.41% | 33.55% | 56.73% |
| **B2** | 2020 | Target>= | 34.00% | 34.50% | 35.00% | 36.00% | 36.00% |
| **B2** | 41.60% | Data | 22.77% | 23.10% | 29.31% | 23.77% | 48.80% |
| **C1** | 2020 | Target>= | 56.50% | 57.00% | 58.50% | 60.00% | 60.00% |
| **C1** | 57.89% | Data | 58.87% | 64.71% | 87.32% | 80.99% | 55.33% |
| **C2** | 2020 | Target>= | 72.00% | 73.00% | 74.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% |
| **C2** | 51.24% | Data | 50.31% | 63.37% | 90.20% | 91.81% | 55.64% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A1>= | 57.80% | 58.30% | 58.80% | 59.30% | 59.80% | 60.30% |
| Target A2>= | 49.84% | 50.34% | 50.84% | 51.34% | 51.84% | 52.34% |
| Target B1>= | 57.08% | 57.58% | 58.08% | 58.58% | 59.08% | 59.58% |
| Target B2>= | 40.10% | 40.60% | 41.10% | 41.60% | 42.10% | 42.60% |
| Target C1>= | 56.39% | 56.89% | 57.39% | 57.89% | 58.39% | 58.89% |
| Target C2>= | 49.74% | 50.24% | 50.74% | 51.24% | 51.74% | 52.24% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

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

1,048

**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 | 19 | 1.81% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 316 | 30.15% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 175 | 16.70% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 313 | 29.87% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 225 | 21.47% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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 | 488 | 823 | 57.51% | 57.80% | 59.30% | N/A | 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 | 538 | 1,048 | 50.14% | 49.84% | 51.34% | N/A | 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 | 13 | 1.24% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 366 | 34.92% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 233 | 22.23% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 303 | 28.91% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 133 | 12.69% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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 | 536 | 915 | 56.73% | 57.08% | 58.58% | N/A | 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 | 436 | 1,048 | 48.80% | 40.10% | 41.60% | N/A | 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 | 28 | 2.67% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 295 | 28.15% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 188 | 17.94% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 256 | 24.43% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 281 | 26.81% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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 | 444 | 767 | 55.33% | 56.39% | 57.89% | N/A | 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 | 537 | 1,048 | 55.64% | 49.74% | 51.24% | N/A | 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 | 1,641 |
| 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. | 191 |

| **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)**

NO

**Provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.”**

Teaching Strategies (TS) GOLD is a scientifically-based authentic, observational assessment system designed for children from birth through third grade. In Nebraska, it is used for children from birth to kindergarten to evaluate their development and learning across the three functional outcomes. At a child's entry and exit, teachers/providers gather and document observations in the GOLD online system, which form the basis of their scoring across four areas of development (social emotional, physical, language, and cognitive) and two areas of content learning (literacy and mathematics). Objectives and dimensions that comprise each of the functional outcomes are based on a crosswalk recommended by the national Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center. Criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" was determined through Item Response Theory (IRT) analyses by Teaching Strategies, based on a national sample. The algorithms result in a 7-point rating system that parallels the ECO Child Outcome Summary (COS) ratings. These ratings by age are programmed into the GOLD online system which generates a rating based on TS GOLD scores. Research studies examining the reliability and validity of TS GOLD may be found at http://teachingstrategies.com/assessment/research/.

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

Teaching Strategies (TS) GOLD, an authentic, observational assessment designed for children birth through 3rd grade, is the assessment used to gather data for Indicator C3. At the child’s entry or at six months of age and at the time of exit from Part C or at age 3, teachers/providers gather and document information from observations of the child or from an interview (e.g., Routine Based Interview) with the parent(s). This data forms the basis of the scoring across four areas of development (social emotional, physical, language, and cognitive) and two areas of content learning (literacy and mathematics). TS GOLD objectives and dimensions that comprise each of the functional outcomes that are reported are based on a crosswalk recommended by the national Early Child Outcomes (ECO) Center. Criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” was determined through Item Response Theory (IRT) analyses by Teaching Strategies, based on a national sample. The algorithms result in a 7-point rating system that parallels the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) ratings. These ratings by age are programmed into the TS GOLD online system which generates a rating based on TS GOLD scores for each functional outcomes. Research studies examining the reliability and validity of the TS GOLD may be found at: https://teachingstrategies.com/our-approach/research/.

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

Nebraska is setting new baselines for Indicator 3 as there was a change in the Teaching Strategies Gold (TSG) assessment tool. The TSG Research Team determined the GOLD thresholds for establishing age-expected functioning were too high for measuring progress in Part C and disproportionately higher than thresholds applied in other assessment tools that Part C providers in other states may choose to use. The discrepancy was attributed to a need for better guidance from OSEP and for a revised methodology from TSG. To update the scoring algorithm, TSG convened a council of stakeholders who use GOLD for OSEP reporting, and Nebraska was highly represented on the stakeholder team. The team collaborated to determine the appropriate cut scores used for converting from scores on GOLD to a 7-point scale. The process included reviewing numerous simulations of impacts to data based on different thresholds for age-expected functioning and discussions of the potential impact to comparisons of historical and future data. After multiple reviews, the Council came to consensus on the new thresholds and Nebraska adopted the updated algorithm for the OSEP reporting process in 2019-2020.   
In order to establish new baselines, we used a 95% confidence interval over 5 years of actual and simulated data with our revised GOLD assessment methodology and cut scores. This data calculation resulted in the values we are using as new baselines for FFY 2020. While we were able to review historical, simulated data, we note that only 2 years of actual data was available, thus we may need to reestablish baseline in the future when longitudinal data is available.   
Upon clarification, OSEP informed Nebraska that revised baseline data must be consistent with previous performance data. Given this information, Nebraska is using FFY 2020 performance data to establish revised baselines. Subsequent targets through FFY 2025 will be set to increase at a 0.5% per year per our stakeholders’ recommendations.

## 3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 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 and the number of respondent families participating in Part C. The survey response rate is auto calculated using the submitted data.

States will be required to compare the current year’s response rate to the previous year(s) response rate(s), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of families that received Part C services.

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers receiving services in the Part C program. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of infant or toddler, and geographic location in the State.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group)

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are not representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers receiving services 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.

Beginning with the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2024, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Part C program, States must include race and ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: socioeconomic status, parents or guardians whose primary language is other than English and who have limited English proficiency, maternal education, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

## 4 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A | 2006 | Target>= | 84.00% | 85.00% | 86.00% | 87.00% | 87.00% |
| A | 73.80% | Data | 86.33% | 85.92% | 87.37% | 89.00% | 92.54% |
| B | 2006 | Target>= | 81.50% | 82.00% | 82.30% | 82.60% | 82.60% |
| B | 70.50% | Data | 84.80% | 84.62% | 86.39% | 88.04% | 92.08% |
| C | 2006 | Target>= | 91.40% | 91.50% | 91.60% | 91.70% | 91.70% |
| C | 84.00% | Data | 95.84% | 88.74% | 89.84% | 96.07% | 96.11% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A>= | 85.92% | 86.92% | 87.92% | 88.92% | 89.92% | 90.92% |
| Target B>= | 84.62% | 85.62% | 86.62% | 87.62% | 88.62% | 89.62% |
| Target C>= | 88.74% | 89.74% | 90.74% | 91.74% | 92.74% | 93.74% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholder Involvement: Nebraska regularly seeks input from stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation or implementation strategies. Specific to the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report, Nebraska has established a broad based stakeholder group. The group includes representatives of parents, school district Directors of Special Education, special education staff, early childhood programs, Routines Based Early Intervention (RBEI) technical assistants, higher education, services coordination, Head Start, Health and Human Services, community agencies, early intervention service providers, court system, psychologists, early childhood special education, and the medical field.  
This group has met periodically throughout the past year and will continue meeting to establish/review targets and performance as indicated in the SPP/APR and the development and implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Thus far the Stakeholders have reviewed historical data around each of the indicators and established targets for each of the indicators. Additionally, the Stakeholders assisted the Co-leads in establishing the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). Stakeholders provided guidance and input on activities and evaluation measures of the SSIP.  
In addition to the Stakeholder group established specifically for the purpose of gathering input on the SSIP and SPP/APR, Nebraska also obtains input from the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) and the Early Childhood Interagency Coordinating Council (ECICC). These Councils are established pursuant to 34 CFR 300.167 and 34 CFR 303.600 and as such provide for input from a diverse group of stakeholders. The Councils regularly discuss the SPP/APR and provide input on the targets and strategies contained therein. SEAC and ECICC will continue to be utilized for input on the development of the SSIP and the SIMR.  
In 2021, the EDN co-leads engaged in several activities to recruit new and diverse parents to our stakeholder groups. We solicited local early intervention programs with historically underserved populations to find diverse parents.   
Please see the Parent Members Engagement section for additional information.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The number of families to whom surveys were distributed | 2,034 |
| Number of respondent families participating in Part C | 1,611 |
| Survey Response Rate | 79.20% |
| A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 1,484 |
| A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 1,611 |
| 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 | 1,448 |
| B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | 1,611 |
| 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 | 1,534 |
| C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn | 1,611 |

| **Measure** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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) | 92.54% | 85.92% | 92.12% | Met 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) | 92.08% | 84.62% | 89.88% | Met 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) | 96.11% | 88.74% | 95.22% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

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

**Survey Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Survey Response Rate | 68.13% | 79.20% |

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

Nebraska is very satisfied with the FFY20 family survey response rate given the global COVID 19 pandemic. We significantly increased our return rate compared to FFY2019. This is evidence that our in-person survey delivery method is an effective strategy that we will continue to implement in the upcoming year. Currently Nebraska provides the family survey in English and Spanish. In order to increase response rates for groups that are underrepresented, we plan to explore providing surveys in additional languages. Additionally, we plan to promote that the EDN services coordinators remind families to complete their surveys more frequently during the survey submission period to ensure we increase our return rate each year.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of families that received Part C services.**

To analyze the response rate, Nebraska compared the number of surveys sent to families with the number of surveys received. The categories we analyzed were race/ethnicity and geographic area. For race/ethnicity we used the race/ethnicity category from NDE data for all surveys sent and compared to the race/ethnicity recorded on returned surveys. Our overall response rate was 78%. African-American or Black families had a response rate of 54%; American Indian or Alaska Native families had a response rate of 66%; Asian families had a response rate of 75%; Hispanic or Latino families had a response rate of 81%; White families had a response rate of 76%; and families of two or more races had a response rate of 109%. We determined that our data had a nonresponse bias for African-American or Black families and an overresponse rate by families of two or more races. These results indicate a possible discrepancy between EDN data sources and we will be working to address those discrepancies to ensure that the most accurate race/ethnicity category is entered for each family across all state data sources. For geographic area, we categorized each Planning Region Team (PRT) into a type of geographic area (Core Metropolitan, Outlying Metropolitan, Micropolitan Core, and Rural with Urban Cluster). We did not see any response bias when looking at geographic areas within the state. Response rates for each geographic area type were all within 2 percentage points of the overall response rate.

**Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Part C program.** **States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of infant or toddler, and geographic location in the State.**

Nebraska used the ECTA Representativeness Calculator to measure the representativeness of respondents for race/ethnicity and geographic area. The Calculator determined that our data were representative of all infants and toddlers for geographic area. For race/ethnicity, Black or African-American families were underrepresented and families of two or more races were overrepresented. This is likely related to the overresponse rate for families of two or more families as described in the paragraph above.

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy, age of the infant or toddler, and geographic location in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

Nebraska used the ECTA Representativeness Calculator to determine representativeness. The ECTA Calculator uses an accepted formula (test of proportional difference) to determine whether the difference between the two percentages is statistically significant (or meaningful), based upon the 90% confidence intervals for each indicator (significance level = .10).

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

## 4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 4 - Required Actions

# 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.

(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 E*DFacts* 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.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 | 0.64% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 0.60% | 0.63% | 0.66% | 0.70% | 0.70% |
| Data | 0.80% | 1.01% | 1.03% | 1.09% | 1.12% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 0.90% | 0.90% | 0.95% | 1.00% | 1.05% | 1.10% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder Involvement: Nebraska regularly seeks input from stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation or implementation strategies. Specific to the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report, Nebraska has established a broad based stakeholder group. The group includes representatives of parents, school district Directors of Special Education, special education staff, early childhood programs, Routines Based Early Intervention (RBEI) technical assistants, higher education, services coordination, Head Start, Health and Human Services, community agencies, early intervention service providers, court system, psychologists, early childhood special education, and the medical field.  
This group has met periodically throughout the past year and will continue meeting to establish/review targets and performance as indicated in the SPP/APR and the development and implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Thus far the Stakeholders have reviewed historical data around each of the indicators and established targets for each of the indicators. Additionally, the Stakeholders assisted the Co-leads in establishing the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). Stakeholders provided guidance and input on activities and evaluation measures of the SSIP.  
In addition to the Stakeholder group established specifically for the purpose of gathering input on the SSIP and SPP/APR, Nebraska also obtains input from the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) and the Early Childhood Interagency Coordinating Council (ECICC). These Councils are established pursuant to 34 CFR 300.167 and 34 CFR 303.600 and as such provide for input from a diverse group of stakeholders. The Councils regularly discuss the SPP/APR and provide input on the targets and strategies contained therein. SEAC and ECICC will continue to be utilized for input on the development of the SSIP and the SIMR.  
In 2021, the EDN co-leads engaged in several activities to recruit new and diverse parents to our stakeholder groups. We solicited local early intervention programs with historically underserved populations to find diverse parents.   
Please see the Parent Members Engagement section for additional information.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age | 07/08/2021 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs | 236 |
| Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2020 | 07/08/2021 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 | 24,961 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs** | **Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 236 | 24,961 | 1.12% | 0.90% | 0.95% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 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.

(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 ED*Facts* 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 . 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 | 1.67% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 1.86% | 1.88% | 1.90% | 1.92% | 1.92% |
| Data | 2.06% | 2.32% | 2.46% | 2.69% | 2.75% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 2.32% | 2.32% | 2.35% | 2.38% | 2.41% | 2.44% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder Involvement: Nebraska regularly seeks input from stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation or implementation strategies. Specific to the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report, Nebraska has established a broad based stakeholder group. The group includes representatives of parents, school district Directors of Special Education, special education staff, early childhood programs, Routines Based Early Intervention (RBEI) technical assistants, higher education, services coordination, Head Start, Health and Human Services, community agencies, early intervention service providers, court system, psychologists, early childhood special education, and the medical field.  
This group has met periodically throughout the past year and will continue meeting to establish/review targets and performance as indicated in the SPP/APR and the development and implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Thus far the Stakeholders have reviewed historical data around each of the indicators and established targets for each of the indicators. Additionally, the Stakeholders assisted the Co-leads in establishing the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). Stakeholders provided guidance and input on activities and evaluation measures of the SSIP.  
In addition to the Stakeholder group established specifically for the purpose of gathering input on the SSIP and SPP/APR, Nebraska also obtains input from the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) and the Early Childhood Interagency Coordinating Council (ECICC). These Councils are established pursuant to 34 CFR 300.167 and 34 CFR 303.600 and as such provide for input from a diverse group of stakeholders. The Councils regularly discuss the SPP/APR and provide input on the targets and strategies contained therein. SEAC and ECICC will continue to be utilized for input on the development of the SSIP and the SIMR.  
In 2021, the EDN co-leads engaged in several activities to recruit new and diverse parents to our stakeholder groups. We solicited local early intervention programs with historically underserved populations to find diverse parents.   
Please see the Parent Members Engagement section for additional information.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age | 07/08/2021 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs | 1,895 |
| Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2020 | 07/08/2021 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 | 75,742 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs** | **Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,895 | 75,742 | 2.75% | 2.32% | 2.50% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), 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 | 79.80% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 85.51% | 93.66% | 97.22% | 84.87% | 90.78% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 112 | 113 | 90.78% | 100% | 99.12% | 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.**

0

**Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.**

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

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.**

The Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) and Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services (NDHHS), acting as co-lead agencies (the CoLeads), are responsible for ensuring Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is fully implemented for all infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families through the Early Development Network (EDN). The Part C Co-Leads monitor the state's Planning Region Teams (PRTs) on a three year cycle. IFSP files and other records maintained by Services Coordinators are reviewed for compliance with IDEA and Medicaid. The Individualized Family Serivce Plan (IFSP) checklist file review for Improving Learning or Children with Disabilities (ILCD) gathers data regarding the receipt of early intervention services on IFSPs in a timely manner. In FFY 2020, 9 of the Planning Regions participated in an IFSP file review for a total of 113 files. In one of the 113 files the 45 day timeline was not met. The Co-Leads notified the 1 program in writing concerning the findings of noncompliance and the requirement that the noncompliance be corrected as soon as possible. The state has verified that the EIS program is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and have ensured that the child received an initial evaluation, assessment and IFSP meeting, although late, and the services listed on the IFSP within a timely manner from the IFSP meeting.

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

The one delay was attributable to provider scheduling delay and miscalculation of timelines.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The Co-Leads notified each EIS program in writing concerning the finding of noncompliance and the requirement that the noncompliance be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year from identification. The State verified that each EIS program not in compliance, correctly implemented the specific regulatory requirement and ensured that all children received an evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, and the services listed on the IFSP in a timely manner as noted in the FFY 2019 APR. Each EIS program was required to develop and implement a Corrective Action Plan to ensure correction of noncompliance within one year. The Co-Leads monitored the implementation of the Corrective Action Plan. In addition, the Co-Leads reviewed files of newly-referred children for assurance that compliance was met and the CAP-related processes, as well as  
specific regulatory requirements, were implemented. Within one year of identification each EIS program was found to be in 100% compliance in meeting the 45-day timeline.

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

Each EIS program was required to develop and implement a Corrective Action Plan to ensure correction of noncompliance within one year. The Co-Leads monitored the implementation of the Corrective Action Plan. The State ensured that each child received an evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, and the services listed on the IFSP in a timely manner as noted in the FFY 2019 APR. In addition, the Co-Leads reviewed files of newly-referred children for assurance that compliance was met and the CAP-related processes, as well as specific regulatory requirements, were implemented. Within one year of identification each EIS program was found to be in 100% compliance in meeting the 45-day timeline.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 7 - Prior FFY 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.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

FFY 2019 findings of noncompliance verified as corrected is addressed within Indicator 7 as required by the template. Please reference Indicator 7.

## 7 - OSEP Response

## 7 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# 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 State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and

C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), 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 | 86.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 75.76% | 69.23% | 93.06% | 51.85% | 89.06% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 42 | 51 | 89.06% | 100% | 82.35% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Slippage can be attributed to 9 transition plans which were found to be out of compliance due to the lack of the individual family step or lack of a specific, individualized step/service necessary to meet the child’s/family’s needs contained within the transition plan. The Part C Co-Leads monitor the state's Planning Region Teams (PRTs) on a three year cycle, therefore 1/3 of the PRTs are monitored each year. In FFY 2020, nine (9) of the Planning Regions participated in an IFSP file review for a total of 113 files, of which 51 files had transition plans reviewed for compliance. In FFY 2019, ten (10) different Planning Regions participated in an IFSP file review for a total of 141 files, of which 64 files had transition plans reviewed for compliance. Because the Co-Leads monitor a different cohort of PRTs each year, we are unable to provide a year to year comparison and unable to identify specific factors for slippage that would provide a valid reason for slippage from year to year. Because the requirements and appropriate documentation of transition plans and timeline for children exiting Part C has a significant impact on the provision of services to infants and toddlers, the Co-Leads believe that it is important to continue training to ensure that all EIS programs correctly implement the specific regulatory requirements and have strategies in place to ensure compliance. The Co-Leads will continue to conduct additional professional development/technical assistance activities as outlined under the Professional Development and Technical Assistance section of the APR.

**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.**

0

**Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.**

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

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.**

The Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) and Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services (NDHHS), acting as co-lead agencies (the Co-Leads), are responsible for ensuring Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is fully implemented for all infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families through the Early Development Network (EDN). The Part C Co-Leads monitor the state's Planning Region Teams (PRTs) on a three year cycle. IFSP files and other records maintained by Services Coordinators are reviewed for compliance with IDEA and Medicaid.   
In FFY 2020, nine (9) of the Planning Regions participated in an IFSP file review for a total of 113 files, of which 51 files had transition plans reviewed for compliance. The Co-Leads determined that all 51 files contained complete transition plans prior to the child exiting Part C. However, 9 transition plans were found to be out of compliance due to the lack of the individual family steps and a specific step/service individualized to the child’s/family’s needs. The Co-Leads notified the 7 EIS programs in writing concerning the findings of noncompliance and the requirement that the noncompliance be corrected as soon as possible but in no case more than one year from identification.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **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 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

In each case of noncompliance, the Co-Leads notified the EIS program in writing concerning the finding of noncompliance and the requirement that the noncompliance be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year from identification. The State verified that each EIS program not in compliance correctly implemented the specific regulatory requirement and ensured that all children exiting Part C received an IFSP with transition steps and services prior to exiting Part C. Each EIS program was required to develop and implement a Corrective Action Plan. In addition, the Co-Leads reviewed different files of children exiting Part C for assurance that compliance was met and the CAP-related processes, as well as specific regulatory requirements were implemented. Within one year of identification each EIS program was found to be in 100% compliance.

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

Each EIS program was required to develop and implement a Corrective Action Plan to ensure correction of noncompliance within one year. The Co-Leads monitored the implementation of the Corrective Action Plan. The state verified that each EIS program correctly implemented the specific regulatory requirements and ensured that all children, who had not yet exited Part C, were provided with appropriate transition plans documenting all necessary transition steps and services prior to the children exiting Part C. In addition, the Co-Leads reviewed additional files of children exiting Part C for assurance that compliance was met and the CAP-related processes, as well as specific regulatory requirements, were implemented. Within one year of identification each EIS program was found to be in 100% compliance. The requirements and appropriate documentation of transition plans for children exiting Part C will continue to be a training topic to ensure that all EIS programs correctly implement the specific regulatory requirements and have strategies in plan to ensure compliance.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 8A - Prior FFY 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.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

FFY 2019 findings of noncompliance verified as corrected is addressed within Indicator 8a as required by the template. Please reference Indicator 8a.

## 8A - OSEP Response

## 8A - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# 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 State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and

C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), 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** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 51 | 51 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met 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.**

0

**Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.**

**Describe the method used to collect these data.**

Nebraska uses State Monitoring. The Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) and Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services (NDHHS), acting as co-lead agencies (a.k.a. the Co-Leads), are responsible for ensuring Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is fully implemented for all infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families through the Early Development Network (EDN). The Part C Co-Leads monitor the state’s Planning Region Teams (PRTs) on a three year cycle. In FFY 2020, nine (9) of the Planning Regions participated in an IFSP file review for a total of 113 files, of which 51 files had children exiting Part C who received proper Notification to LEA and SEA as the child was potentially eligible for Part B.

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

NO

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

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.**

The Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) and Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services (NDHHS), acting as co-lead agencies (the Co-Leads), are responsible for ensuring Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is fully implemented for all infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families through the Early Development Network (EDN). The Part C Co-Leads monitor the state's Planning Region Teams (PRTs) on a three year cycle. IFSP files and other records maintained by Services Coordinators are reviewed for compliance with IDEA and Medicaid.   
In FFY 2020, nine (9) of the Planning Regions participated in an IFSP file review for a total of 113 files, of which 51 files had children exiting Part C who received proper Notification to LEA and SEA as the child was potentially eligible for Part B.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **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 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 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

# 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 State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and

C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), 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 | 100.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 96.97% | 76.92% | 95.83% | 87.04% | 87.50% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 49 | 51 | 87.50% | 100% | 96.08% | 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.**

0

**Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.**

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

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.**

The Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) and Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services (NDHHS), acting as co-lead agencies (the Co-Leads), are responsible for ensuring Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is fully implemented for all infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families through the Early Development Network (EDN). The Part C Co-Leads monitor the state's Planning Region Teams (PRTs) on a three year cycle. IFSP files and other records maintained by Services Coordinators are reviewed for compliance with IDEA and Medicaid.   
In FFY 2020, nine (9) of the Planning Regions participated in an IFSP file review for a total of 113 files, of which 51 files had children exiting Part C in which it was required to conduct a transition conference by the third birthday. The Co-Leads notified the 2 EIS programs in writing concerning the findings of noncompliance and the requirement that the noncompliance be corrected as soon as possible but in no case more than one year from identification. The State has verified that the EIS programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and have ensured that the child/family received a transition conference and plan, although late, and the services listed on the IFSP within a timely manner from the IFSP meeting.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

In each case of noncompliance, the Co-Leads notified the EIS program in writing concerning the finding of noncompliance and the requirement that the noncompliance be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year from identification. The State verified that each EIS program not in compliance correctly implemented the specific regulatory requirement and ensured that all children exiting Part C received a transition conference prior to exiting Part C. Each EIS program was required to develop and implement a Corrective Action Plan. In addition, the Co-Leads reviewed different files of children exiting Part C for assurance that compliance was met and the CAP-related processes, as well as specific regulatory requirements were implemented. Within one year of identification each EIS program was found to be in 100% compliance.

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

Each EIS program was required to develop and implement a Corrective Action Plan to ensure correction of noncompliance within one year. The Co-Leads monitored the implementation of the Corrective Action Plan. The state has verified that each EIS program was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and ensured that all children, who had not yet exited Part C, received a transition conference prior to exiting Part C.  
In addition, the Co-Leads reviewed additional files of children exiting Part C for assurance that compliance was met and the CAP-related processes, as well as specific regulatory requirements, were implemented. Within one year of identification each EIS program was found to be in 100% compliance. The transition conference/planning requirements for children exiting Part C will continue to be a training topic to ensure that all EIS programs correctly implement the specific regulatory requirements and have strategies in plan to ensure compliance.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 8C - Prior FFY 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.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

FFY 2019 findings of noncompliance verified as corrected is addressed within Indicator 8c as required by the template. Please reference Indicator 8c.

## 8C - OSEP Response

## 8C - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# 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 under section 615 of the IDEA are adopted). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED*Facts* 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.**

NO

**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 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/03/2021 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 0 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/03/2021 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 0 |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholder Involvement: Nebraska regularly seeks input from stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation or implementation strategies. Specific to the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report, Nebraska has established a broad based stakeholder group. The group includes representatives of parents, school district Directors of Special Education, special education staff, early childhood programs, Routines Based Early Intervention (RBEI) technical assistants, higher education, services coordination, Head Start, Health and Human Services, community agencies, early intervention service providers, court system, psychologists, early childhood special education, and the medical field.  
This group has met periodically throughout the past year and will continue meeting to establish/review targets and performance as indicated in the SPP/APR and the development and implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Thus far the Stakeholders have reviewed historical data around each of the indicators and established targets for each of the indicators. Additionally, the Stakeholders assisted the Co-leads in establishing the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). Stakeholders provided guidance and input on activities and evaluation measures of the SSIP.  
In addition to the Stakeholder group established specifically for the purpose of gathering input on the SSIP and SPP/APR, Nebraska also obtains input from the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) and the Early Childhood Interagency Coordinating Council (ECICC). These Councils are established pursuant to 34 CFR 300.167 and 34 CFR 303.600 and as such provide for input from a diverse group of stakeholders. The Councils regularly discuss the SPP/APR and provide input on the targets and strategies contained therein. SEAC and ECICC will continue to be utilized for input on the development of the SSIP and the SIMR.  
In 2021, the EDN co-leads engaged in several activities to recruit new and diverse parents to our stakeholder groups. We solicited local early intervention programs with historically underserved populations to find diverse parents.   
Please see the Parent Members Engagement section for additional information.

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target>= |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |

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

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2020. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

## 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 ED*Facts* 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.

The consensus among mediation practitioners is that 75-85% is a reasonable rate of mediations that result in agreements and is consistent with national mediation success rate data. States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s 618 data, explain.

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

## 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 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1 Mediations held | 0 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 0 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 0 |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder Involvement: Nebraska regularly seeks input from stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation or implementation strategies. Specific to the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report, Nebraska has established a broad based stakeholder group. The group includes representatives of parents, school district Directors of Special Education, special education staff, early childhood programs, Routines Based Early Intervention (RBEI) technical assistants, higher education, services coordination, Head Start, Health and Human Services, community agencies, early intervention service providers, court system, psychologists, early childhood special education, and the medical field.  
This group has met periodically throughout the past year and will continue meeting to establish/review targets and performance as indicated in the SPP/APR and the development and implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Thus far the Stakeholders have reviewed historical data around each of the indicators and established targets for each of the indicators. Additionally, the Stakeholders assisted the Co-leads in establishing the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). Stakeholders provided guidance and input on activities and evaluation measures of the SSIP.  
In addition to the Stakeholder group established specifically for the purpose of gathering input on the SSIP and SPP/APR, Nebraska also obtains input from the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) and the Early Childhood Interagency Coordinating Council (ECICC). These Councils are established pursuant to 34 CFR 300.167 and 34 CFR 303.600 and as such provide for input from a diverse group of stakeholders. The Councils regularly discuss the SPP/APR and provide input on the targets and strategies contained therein. SEAC and ECICC will continue to be utilized for input on the development of the SSIP and the SIMR.  
In 2021, the EDN co-leads engaged in several activities to recruit new and diverse parents to our stakeholder groups. We solicited local early intervention programs with historically underserved populations to find diverse parents.   
Please see the Parent Members Engagement section for additional information.

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target>= |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data |  |  |  |  | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.00% |  |  | 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 2020. 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

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

***Baseline Data:*** The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

***Targets:*** In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State’s FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State’s baseline data.

***Updated Data:*** In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families by improving early intervention services. Stakeholders, including parents of infants and toddlers with disabilities, early intervention service (EIS) programs and providers, the State Interagency Coordinating Council, and others, are critical participants in improving results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and must be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State’s targets under Indicator 11. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

*Phase I: Analysis*:

- Data Analysis;

- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;

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

- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and

- Theory of Action.

*Phase II: Plan* (which is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;

- Support for EIS Program and/or EIS Provider Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and

- Evaluation.

*Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation* (which is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

**Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP**

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

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

***Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation***

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

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State’s last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

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

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

## 11 - Indicator Data

**Section A: Data Analysis**

**What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?**

Increase the number and percentage of infants and toddlers who demonstrate progress in the acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) – Indicator C3B, Summary Statement 1. Additionally, Nebraska identified Indicator C4B: Effectively Communicate Child’s Needs as a benchmark.

**Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (*e.g.*, a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)**

YES

**Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.**

Nebraska is utilizing a cohort approach to scale-up the three coherent improvement strategies through the state’s Planning Region Team system. Cohort 1, composed of PRTs 7, 22 and 27, began RBI and functional IFSP outcome training in January 2015. Cohort 2, composed of PRTs 4, 18, 19, and 21, began RBI and functional IFSP outcome training a year later (January 2016). Cohort 1 received training on strategy 3, routines-based home visits, in June 2017. Cohort 2 received this training in June 2018.

**Is the State’s theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Please provide a link to the current theory of action.**

https://edn.ne.gov/cms/october-2021-rda-stakeholder-meeting

Progress toward the SiMR

**Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages)*.***

**Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 58.58% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= | 57.08% | 57.58% | 58.08% | 58.58% | 59.08% | 59.58% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3B Summary Statement 1 Numerator | 3B Summary Statement 1 Denominator | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 536 | 915 | 56.73% | 57.08% | 58.58% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.**

Teaching Strategies GOLD

**Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR**.

Teaching Strategies (TS) GOLD, an authentic, observational assessment designed for children birth through 3rd grade, is the assessment used to gather data for Indicator C3. At the child’s entry or at six months of age and at the time of exit from Part C or at age 3, teachers/providers gather and document information from observations of the child or from an interview (e.g., Routine Based Interview) with the parent(s). This data forms the basis of the scoring across four areas of development (social emotional, physical, language, and cognitive) and two areas of content learning (literacy and mathematics). TS GOLD objectives and dimensions that comprise each of the functional outcomes that are reported are based on a crosswalk recommended by the national Early Child Outcomes (ECO) Center. Criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” was determined through Item Response Theory (IRT) analyses by Teaching Strategies, based on a national sample. The algorithms result in a 7-point rating system that parallels the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) ratings. These ratings by age are programmed into the TS GOLD online system which generates a rating based on TS GOLD scores for each functional outcomes. Research studies examining the reliability and validity of the TS GOLD may be found at: https://teachingstrategies.com/our-approach/research/.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data *(i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey)* that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.**

Nebraska identified Indicator C4B: Effectively Communicate Child’s Needs as a benchmark. The percent of families reporting that they are effectively able to communicate their children’s needs continues to trend upwards, as noted in our annual Part C family survey data.

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any data quality issues, unrelated to COVID-19**, **specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns.**

Nebraska did under go changes with its Teaching Strategies GOLD (TSG) assessment tool. TSG Research Team determined the GOLD thresholds for establishing age-expected functioning were too high for measuring progress in Part C and disproportionately higher than thresholds applied in other assessment tools that Part C providers in other states may choose to use. The discrepancy was attributed to a need for better guidance from OSEP and for a revised methodology from TSG. To update the scoring algorithm, TSG convened a council of stakeholders who use GOLD for OSEP reporting, and Nebraska was highly represented on the stakeholder team. The team collaborated to determine the appropriate cut scores used for converting from scores on GOLD to a 7-point scale. The process included reviewing numerous simulations of impacts to data based on different thresholds for age-expected functioning and discussions of the potential impact to comparisons of historical and future data. After multiple reviews, the Council came to consensus on the new thresholds and Nebraska adopted the updated algorithm for the OSEP reporting process in 2019-2020. Additionally, to better match OSEP’s definition of no improvement in functioning, Teaching Strategies revised its algorithm for assignment to progress category A. Previously, the algorithm assigned children to category A if there was no change or a regression in the total score for the outcome between entry and exit. The revised algorithm now evaluates progress at the item level. This change provides a more incremental way to measure children’s growth and development and, thus, enhances progress monitoring for children with severe developmental delays. This change yielded a positive effect on our progress category distributions this year resulting in a smaller proportion of children falling into progress category A and a larger proportion of children falling into progress category B.   
It should be noted that these changes did not affect progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period.

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

**Is the State’s evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Describe how the data support the decision not to make revisions to the evaluation plan. Please provide a link to the State’s current evaluation plan.**

Outcome data analysis. In the annual IFSP outcome analysis from the cohort PRTs, the Co-Leads look at both “quality” and “quantity.” Regarding quality, the state uses a Quality Outcome Checklist to score child and family outcomes, looking for an increase in quality scores over time. Regarding quantity, the state looks for a mean number of outcomes within the range of 6-12 outcomes per IFSP, with a mix of child and family outcomes as appropriate. The state conducted the sixth annual IFSP outcome analysis for cohort 1. Regarding quantity, results indicated significant improvement in the mean number of IFSP outcomes when compared to baseline. Regarding outcome quality, results indicated that cohort 1 continues to demonstrate strong quality scores with an average of 4.2/5(84%) for child outcomes and 2.8/3(93%) for family outcomes.   
  
The state conducted the fifth annual IFSP outcome analysis for cohort 2 and feedback was provided to the regions.Regarding quantity, results indicated significant improvement in the mean number of IFSP outcomes when compared to baseline. Regarding outcome quality of IFSP outcomes, 6- year trend data for Cohort 1 regions demonstrated a steady increase in the mean scores for child outcomes with an average score of 4.3/5 (86%) for child outcomes and 2.4/3 (81%) for family outcomes. Cohort 2 regions also received feedback regarding their fifth annual IFSP outcome analysis. Regarding quantity, all regions in the cohort demonstrated significant improvement in the mean number of IFSP outcomes when compared to baseline. Three of the four regions had a mean number within the expected range. Regarding the quality of the IFSP outcomes, 5-year trend data for all four regions demonstrated a steady increase in the mean scores for child outcomes, 4.3/5 (86%) and good quality scores for family outcomes 2.4/3 (81%). The state RBEI coordinators continue to provide targeted technical assistance and training to the cohorts to ensure continued improvement in quality and quantity of IFSP outcomes.  
  
Fidelity: Annual fidelity evaluation data for each cohort remains stable.   
  
Annual Part C Family Survey: Four new questions were added to the family survey related to the implementation of the 3 coherent improvement strategies. Analysis of these additional questions confirmed the cohorts are implementing RBEI practices to fidelity.   
  
Qualitative Evidence: The Co-Leads contracted with Dr. Miriam Kuhn from the University of Nebraska Omaha and Dr. Johanna Taylor from the University of Nebraska Lincoln to conduct a qualitative study to better understand family, SC, and EI provider experiences with routines-based home visits utilizing the Getting Ready (GR) Approach. There were several key findings: (1) Participants described robust partnerships between professionals and family members and the presence of family-centered practices including coaching during home visits, child skill/behavior practice within family routines, consistent use of home visit practice plans and increased frequency of communication between visits; (2) families increasingly took ownership of the home visit agenda and strategies needed during home visits.  
  
This data supports the decision not to make revisions to the evaluation plan.  
  
Here is the link to the current evaluation plan: https://edn.ne.gov/cms/state-systemic-improvement-plans-ssip  
  
The FFY 2019 SSIP contains our evaluation plan and can be found on pages 6-8 and 11-12 at this link under the FFY 2019 SSIP: https://edn.ne.gov/cms/state-systemic-improvement-plans-ssip   
  
Please note that the link to Nebraska’s current evaluation plan can be found on page 42 of the FFY 2020 APR:   
The evaluation plan is also outlined in the FFY 2020 APR and includes: Annual Fidelity checks for Cohort Regions across the 3 EBP’s, Annual IFSP Quality Outcome Analysis for Cohort Regions, Qualitative evaluation by University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) regarding improving a sustainable coaching system to reinforce the RBEI process (UNL received an OSEP-funded grant for this purpose, entitled “Coaching in EI: Promoting Outcomes for Infants/Toddlers with disabilities through Evidence-Based Practices”), Development of a unified fidelity evaluation process across the 3 EBP’s by the University of Nebraska, and Qualitative evaluation by the University of Nebraska – Omaha (UNO) regarding family, SC and EI provider experiences with routines-based home visits utilizing the Getting Ready Approach

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period.**

Two changes were made to the Part C SSIP Leadership team this year: first, Julie Docter- Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Part C Co-Coordinator retired in December 2020. She was replaced by Jessica Anthony - Department of Health and Human Services. Second, Cindy Hankey, RBEI State Coordinator, retired in the summer of 2021. She was replaced by Jeanne Fielder, an EI provider who retired from EI services in a Nebraska school district. The Part C SSIP Leadership team currently consists of Amy Bunnell (NDE Part C Co-Coordinator), Cole Johnson (Part C Data Manager/PRT Coordinator), Jessica Anthony (Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Part C Co-Coordinator), Sue Bainter, Jeanne Fielder, and Janice Lee, RBEI state coordinators.  
  
Nebraska’s technical assistance system consists of:   
(a) State Leadership Team - Meets for a day long meeting monthly; has weekly calls, utilizes access to a database of PRT activities which allows for oversight of all training and new initiatives, while monitoring and working with the local planning region teams (PRT) to improve EI services;  
(b) 3 State Coordinators - Provide training, follow up and supports to 7 cohort PRT’s and leadership teams, trains and supports regional TA Providers, and develops training materials;   
(c) 4 Regional TA Providers - geographically located to support non-cohort PRTs, provide training and TA to non-cohort PRT’s;  
(d) Local PRT Leadership teams - 3-5 people (administrators, service coordination, providers ) responsible for implementation of EB practices, evaluation efforts, fidelity in their region;  
(e) Local PRT coaches - trained as coaches for the evidence based practices (EBP) to provide fidelity, implementation support, and training of new staff to EI providers and services coordinators in their region.

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

The following professional development and technical assistance strategies support system change and are necessary for statewide scale up:  
1. The Co-Leads received feedback from stakeholders which supports the continued use of virtual training in addition to face to face training in order to effectively reach the far west side of Nebraska which, because of geography, is more likely to utilize professional development in this format as their preferred method of conducting business. Using both face to face and virtual options will allow the state leadership team to complete the scale-up of the evidence based practices as well as making it more convenient for sustaining the practices through ongoing offering of both training and approval/fidelity requirements.   
2. A new training has been developed: “Using the RBI and Quality Home Visits to Develop a Quality IFSP.” This training is designed to support participants utilizing information from Routines Based Interviews, Quality Home Visits, and Ongoing Assessment to collaborate with families in developing functional, family-centered IFSPs. The training content includes the process of turning Routines Based Interview priorities into measurable outcomes and improving quality related to the outcome structures of "child and family strengths and resources" and "what will be done by whom". The IFSP training is a result of feedback from the field asking for guidance in facilitating and writing IFSPs given that the RBI is used as child and family assessment, and routines based home visits are utilized to carry out the IFSPs.

**Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe each new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved*.***

Mary Phillips the newest member of the Part C SSIP Leadership team was introduced in the summer of 2021 and will focus on supporting PRTs to develop strong leadership to support the implementation of the RDA Strategies. Our experience with the PRTs the last few years has led us to the clear understanding that the strategies cannot be successfully implemented without strong leadership teams. Deliverables from this new infrastructure strategy will include: creating a clear understanding of the role and function of the leadership team; developing a sustainable data review process at the local level in order to contribute to a continuous improvement plan; assisting with building an infrastructure for ongoing implementation with fidelity, and creating and carrying out an evaluation plan to measure progress.  
Dr. Lisa Knoche, from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, received a grant award from OSEP and will lead a research study: Coaching in Early Intervention: Promoting Outcomes for Infants/Toddlers with Disabilities through Evidence-Based Practices. This is the only OSEP grant to focus on a Birth to 3 Early Intervention sustainable coaching system. This 4-year project, which began in November 2020, builds on Nebraska’s current work with the three improvement strategies and aims to improve outcomes for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families through the refinement, implementation, and evaluation of a systematic and sustainable coaching system to reinforce the use of evidence-based practices by early intervention providers and services coordinators. Critical to the state’s RDA plan, this project is especially exciting as it will enhance the coaching infrastructure developed during the first 5-year SSIP cycle and have a direct impact on the quality and sustainability of the state’s coaching practices, ultimately resulting in improved results for children and families. The results, therefore, will be incorporated directly into Nebraska’s SSIP, in addition to being reported nationally. For more information on this project and a short video please go to https://cei.unl.edu/ Year 1 was spent on preparation for implementation: development of training materials, evaluation measures, Internal Review Board (IRB) approval, technology, recruitment and soliciting feedback from stakeholders regarding these components. Based upon feedback, this training and implementation will be implemented via a demonstration project model. Training has been initiated with the first two demonstration sites.

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

By providing expertise and technical assistance for PRT leadership team development, our anticipated outcome is that the PRTs will have a clear understanding of the role and function of the leadership team; will develop a sustainable data review process to contribute to a continuous improvement plan; will build an infrastructure for ongoing implementation with fidelity and create an evaluation plan to measure progress.   
Coaching in Early Intervention (CEI) - The training of the first project demonstration site occurred in 2021. Full implementation will occur in 2022 and will center around formative assessment of salient project components including training, group and individual coaching supports, evaluation measures, coaching tools, a child outcome scale, etc. These project components will guide implementation within years 3 and 4. One project demonstration site will be added in each of years 2, 3, and 4. Evidence-based coaching practices will be enacted in peer-to-peer coaching interactions. Data collection and use will be embedded within the model to support and improve the coaching system.

**List the selected evidence-based practices implemented in the reporting period:**

1. The Routines-Based Interview (RBI);- Child and Family Assessment  
2. Functional child and family Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) outcomes; and  
3. Routines-based home visits (Getting Ready Approach)

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practice.**

The RBI is a semi-structured interview (McWilliam, 2010) during which the family describes their day to day life in terms of their child and family’s function, what’s going well and what’s not, DEC Recommended Practice - A7. Practitioners obtain information about the child’s skills in daily activities, routines, and environments such as home, center, and community.  
Functional IFSP outcomes (Boavida et al., 2014) are based on child participation within everyday routines (child outcomes), and family perceived needs – housing, education, medical resources, etc. (family outcomes). DEC Recommended Practice - F4. Practitioners and the family work together to create outcomes or goals,develop individualized plans, and implement practices that address the family’s priorities and concerns and the child’s strengths and needs.  
Routines-based home visits are accomplished via the Getting Ready Approach which is a relationally based parent engagement intervention promoting school and social readiness for young children from birth to age 5 (Sheridan et al., 2008; Sheridan et al., 2010). It has been implemented effectively in the context of home visitation services. Grounded in ecological theory, it focuses on strengthening collaborative partnerships between early childhood professionals and parents. DEC Recommended Practices - INS13. Practitioners use coaching or consultation strategies with primary caregivers or other adults to facilitate positive adult-child interactions and instruction intentionally designed to promote child learning and development.

**Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practices and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child/outcomes.**

The improvement strategies, as a unified set, are referred to as a “routines-based early intervention” (RBEI) approach. Nebraska expects to see a positive effect on the SiMR when EI teams (1) fully implement an evidence-based child and family assessment (RBI); (2) use the priorities identified during the RBI to develop functional child and family IFSP outcomes based on everyday routines; and (3) implement routines-based home visits focused on meeting the child and family IFSP outcomes. Child outcomes will improve because all 3 strategies are based on evidence about how young children learn - from everyday learning opportunities and with the people/materials/environment that are most familiar to them. EI personnel are trained and approved in the 3 practices through a standardized process including trained facilitators, coaching for approval according to a checklist which is also used to determine annual fidelity. Therefore, once training and approval has occurred, improvements in child outcomes can be attributed to the practices which are implemented in a consistent way. Nebraska also chose to use Indicator C4B as a benchmark for the SiMR. The Co-leads believe that taken together, the three improvement strategies of the SSIP will increase families’ perceptions of their ability to effectively communicate their children’s needs.

**Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.**

For the 7 cohort PRTs: RBI - RBI Implementation Checklists documenting 85% accuracy or better are used at initial approval and annually for fidelity and ; completed by RBI approved coaches; Functional IFSP child and family outcomes - annual analysis of the quality and quantity of IFSPs using the state’s IFSP Quality Outcome Checklist; Quality routines-based home visits - Home Visit Implementation Checklist documenting state determined 80% initial approval level and used annually for fidelity; completed by Home Visit approved coaches. As a reminder, in 2020 all fidelity approvals and checks were moved to a virtual process. This was maintained into 2021 due to impacts of COVID-19. In-person fidelity checks resumed in Summer of 2021.

**Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

Data from the IFSP Outcome Analysis conducted annually demonstrates growth across cohorts since baseline in both quantity and quality indicators.  
Following RBI Boot Camp training, providers/services coordinators, families, and coaches are asked to complete an evaluation. Data from the evaluations are overall favorable and support the continuation of the practice. Specifically, data from the RBI Boot Camp evaluations indicate that as a result of the training, participants are prepared to complete Routines Based Interviews. When asked the question “Are you confident that you can successfully complete an RBI?” 89 % of the participants answered “yes.”. 98% would recommend the boot camp to others and 97% agree that the virtual format is suitable for the training content.  
Following the Getting Ready Approach training, providers and services coordinators are asked to complete an evaluation. Using retrospective ratings, the providers scored their knowledge of practices to support quality home visitation at an average of 4.83 on a scale of 1-6. Services Coordinators scored their knowledge of practices to support quality home visitation at an average of 5.0 on the 1-6 scale. Further, providers and services coordinators noted that the training would increase parent understanding and capacity, which would in turn have a positive effect on outcomes for children.  
Four new questions were added to the Annual Part C Family Survey related to the implementation of the 3 coherent improvement strategies. Analysis of these additional questions confirmed that providers and services coordinators are implementing RBEI practices effectively.

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

Next steps for Nebraska’s evidence-based practices include to continue with annual fidelity checks for RBI and quality routines-based home visits as well as annual analysis of IFSP outcomes.   
In partnership with the University of Nebraska-Omaha, address implementation challenges that emerged from the 2019 qualitative studies (described above) to refine evidence-based practices: 1) Provide guidance about (a) the role of the EDN Services Coordinator within the GR framework and (b) the frequency and purpose of covisits as part of service delivery; 2) Develop guidance regarding “communication” with families (text, email, video, phone) between home visits for enhanced support, and 3) identify strategies for working with diverse families using the Getting Ready Approach for quality routines based home visits.

**Describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.**

See above information related to supporting the evaluation plan

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder Involvement: Nebraska regularly seeks input from stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation or implementation strategies. Specific to the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report, Nebraska has established a broad based stakeholder group. The group includes representatives of parents, school district Directors of Special Education, special education staff, early childhood programs, Routines Based Early Intervention (RBEI) technical assistants, higher education, services coordination, Head Start, Health and Human Services, community agencies, early intervention service providers, court system, psychologists, early childhood special education, and the medical field.  
This group has met periodically throughout the past year and will continue meeting to establish/review targets and performance as indicated in the SPP/APR and the development and implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Thus far the Stakeholders have reviewed historical data around each of the indicators and established targets for each of the indicators. Additionally, the Stakeholders assisted the Co-leads in establishing the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). Stakeholders provided guidance and input on activities and evaluation measures of the SSIP.  
In addition to the Stakeholder group established specifically for the purpose of gathering input on the SSIP and SPP/APR, Nebraska also obtains input from the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) and the Early Childhood Interagency Coordinating Council (ECICC). These Councils are established pursuant to 34 CFR 300.167 and 34 CFR 303.600 and as such provide for input from a diverse group of stakeholders. The Councils regularly discuss the SPP/APR and provide input on the targets and strategies contained therein. SEAC and ECICC will continue to be utilized for input on the development of the SSIP and the SIMR.  
In 2021, the EDN co-leads engaged in several activities to recruit new and diverse parents to our stakeholder groups. We solicited local early intervention programs with historically underserved populations to find diverse parents.   
Please see the Parent Members Engagement section for additional information.

**Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

In October and November of 2021, we engaged in two virtual stakeholder meetings due to the COVID 19 pandemic as well as to accommodate families’ schedules. In advance of these meetings, we engaged in several activities to ensure the parent voice was appropriately captured. The EDN co-leads participated in active parent recruitment with all 28 local early intervention programs. We additionally targeted local programs with higher numbers of historically underserved populations to ensure a diverse parent stakeholder make up. Personal contacts and invitations were made with all new parent recruits including ICC parent members. We additionally offered parents stipends to assist with any lost wages and child care to ensure participation. The co-leads also engaged with PTI Nebraska and the University of Nebraska Monroe Meyer Institute, a disability advocacy center, to cohost and facilitate an orientation meeting with the stakeholder parents one week prior to the meeting to provide an overview of the SSIP and SPP-APR to ensure the parents had the appropriate context and information needed to actively participate. All stakeholders were provided copies of the meeting materials in advance of the meeting to give them time to review the data, evaluation progress, proposed targets, and improvement strategies. During the stakeholder meetings engagement strategies included participants' ability to share their input via audio or chat box. Additionally, input was solicited via open discussion and polls.

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

NO

**Additional Implementation Activities**

**List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.**

The qualitative study by Dr. Miriam Kuhn from the University of Nebraska Omaha and Dr. Johanna Higgins from the University of Nebraska Lincoln conducted in 2019 led to some additional findings in which the RDA stakeholder members recommended further investigation. Findings included evidence of implementation challenges in communication with families (i.e., use of personal cell phones, managing communication with high caseloads, etc.), and uncertainty about the role of the services coordinator during home visits utilizing the Getting Ready Approach. Based upon RDA stakeholder feedback, the co-leads are contracting with Dr Kuhn and Dr Higgins in 2022 to:  
 Conduct another qualitative study to provide guidance about (1) the role of the services coordinator within the GR framework, and (2) the frequency and purpose of co-visits as part of service delivery.  
 Create professional development materials that can be disseminated to Early Intervention providers and services coordinators to enhance communication that occurs with families between visits that promotes child and family outcomes. The purpose of the communication is to extend the interventions that are addressed DURING homes by building family capacity through these between visit contacts.

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

Dr. Kuhn’s study will focus on data collection in 2022. Participants will be recruited from three populations: (a) SCs trained and approved in the three RDA strategies in Nebraska as identified by the Co-Lead Agencies, (b) supervisors of trained/approved SCs, and (c) early intervention providers who have also been trained/approved in the three RDA strategies and who work with trained/approved SCs. It is expected that the surveys will provide quantitative descriptions of SC practices. The quantitative results will then inform the second stage of the study which focuses on gathering qualitative data from two sources. One source of data will be focus group interviews of representative groups from the three populations with the second source being samples of their de-identified and completed Home Visit plans. The expected outcome of the data collection will be in preparation for analysis to guide SC development of partnerships with parents and SC roles/responsibilities.  
  
Dr. Higgins’s project in 2022 will be to build the evidence based literature which supports strategies to enhance communication between EI visits (e.g., why do EI professionals communicate between visits, how does communication enhance caregiver competence, resources available in the field). In addition, an exploration of the kinds of technology (e.g., online portals, smartphone apps) that are currently available, and may be used, for professionals and caregivers to communicate. The expected outcomes will be to collect the information and experiences to guide the creation of professional development tools and formats to be delivered in the following year.

**Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

There are no newly identified barriers pertaining to the additional implementation activities.

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

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 11 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020 and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 11 - Required Actions
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