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# Introduction

**Instructions**

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

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

The New Hampshire (NH) Part C program is called Family Centered Early Supports and Services (FCESS). The Family Centered Early Supports and Services Program is administered by the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). There are 10 Area Agencies that oversee developmental services in the 10 geographical regions of NH. The 10 agencies contract with the NH Bureau of Developmental Services (BDS) to provide Part C FCESS. Under the supervision of the Area Agencies there are 15 FCESS local programs with a total of approximately 230 staff employed or contracted by the local programs. The Bureau of Family Centered Services (BFCS) acts as an agent for BDS and is tasked with ensuring the quality, flexibility, and responsiveness of services and supports statewide by; (a) monitoring effectiveness, (b) incorporating data, and (c) incorporating feedback from families, service providers and communities into systemic decision making.  
  
The NH Part C FCESS system strives to ensure that all children and families are respected for their unique individual beliefs, values, and culture. Anyone with a concern about a child’s development can refer a child to FCESS. FCESS activities are family centered. NH’s program uses evidence based practices to build the capacity of a child's family and/or caregiver to help the child learn and grow to their full potential. Families are engaged from the start to plan, evaluate, and implement individualized strategies, with the support of caring professionals. Services are provided in the child’s natural environment. This means that strategies are designed to be integrated into the child’s everyday routines and interactions. Research shows that this is how young children learn best.   
  
The US Department of Education (US DOE), Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) determines indicators for statewide early intervention programs to ensure equitable, timely, and quality services for all eligible children and families. New Hampshire He-M 510 and He-M 203 state rules reinforce the importance of compliance with the OSEP indicators. The purpose of this report is to illustrate the NH Part C FCESS system compliance with federal indicators of quality, during the period of 7/1/19 to 6/30/20.   
  
The New Hampshire Bureau of Family Centered Services and Part C State Office staff provide the supervision required by the federal government to administer the Part C grant. Area Agencies and local programs are monitored to ensure that eligible children and families are receiving high quality services, in compliance with state and federal regulations governing Part C FCESS. The rules governing NH FCESS are available at http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/rules/state\_agencies/he-m.html. The data and narrative contained within this report, illustrate how the State of NH Part C system has performed, according to the national standards for Part C.   
  
The data in this report was collected using; (a) the NH Leads data system, (b) the national census, (c) state birth cohort data, and (d) the Family Outcome Survey. The compliance data was verified through a virtual monitoring processes. The data from the NH Leads system paired with qualitative input from families, staff, and stakeholders informs our systemic decisions. Training on data entry and using data for decision making continues to improve data reliability and validity for the NH Part C FCESS statewide system.   
  
Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic and the State of Emergency Stay at Home order in March 2020, the Part C State Office staff were unable to conduct on-site monitoring for this FFY19 reporting year. Although the COVID-19 Pandemic did not have a significant impact on data collection, the state does believe it did have some impact on data results specifically for Indicators 3 Child Outcomes and Indicator 4 Family Outcome Survey. It was difficult to engage families in determining Indicator 3 exit ratings and respond to family survey during the initial months of the pandemic. Families were prioritizing a variety of changes to their schedules during this time. The pandemic also impacted the state’s ability to engage stakeholders in a variety of data analysis activities.  
  
In response to the Department’s 2020 requirement for the state to engage in technical assistance due to determination of needs assistance in both 2019 and 2020, New Hampshire (NH) engaged in monthly data analysis with national technical assistance (TA) that included the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy Center) and a Principal Education Researcher at the Center for Learning and Development / SRI Education regarding Indicator 3 Child Outcomes performance. Through analysis of Indicator 3 Child Outcome five year trend data including before and after statewide COS training, we found that the current data are actually a better reflection of the functioning and progress of children who have been served in NH all along in comparison to previous years target due to NH moving closer to the national average. NH’s outcomes data collection system is becoming stronger and the observed decreases result from the statewide Child Outcome Summary training during September 2017 through May 2018 rather than from lower quality services being provided to children and families. NH also attended weekly and monthly ICTA Member meetings and DaSy Part C Data Managers Community Call. Information gathered through these calls during FFY19 were implemented into ensuring quality services to children and families were provided during the COVID-19 Pandemic and that the state was collecting valid and reliable data for reporting.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

NH did not achieve the target of 100% compliance for Indicators 7 45-day timeline, 8b notification to the LEA and SEA, and 8c transition conference, NH did achieve 100%compliance for Indicator 1 timely service and Indicator 8a transition plan development. Slippage from FFY18 to FFY19 data was observed for Indicators 8b notification to the LEA and SEA and 8c transition conference. Data for Indicator 2 showed NH did not meet the target and identified an increase in families requesting services in other locations. NH did not meet targets for Indicator 3 Child Outcomes and Indicator 4 Family Survey and slippage from FFY18 to FFY19 data was observed. NH did exceed targets for Indicators 5 and 6 Child Find. Indicator 9 and 10 data showed that no complaints were elevated to resolution or mediation sessions. Overall the state of New Hampshire Part C FCESS system performed well this year in areas of child find, compliance, and quality service provision.

**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.**

New Hampshire (NH) Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) is the lead agency for the NH Part C program. Within DHHS, the Bureau of Family Centered Services (BFCS), as an agent for the Bureau of Developmental Services (BDS), takes responsibility for all required components of IDEA, federal, and state mandates related to Part C, known in NH as Family Centered Early Supports and Services (FCESS). The state is divided into ten regions in which each have an Area Agency (AA). The AAs contract with BDS to provide FCESS in their regions through their own program or subcontracts with a vendor program(s). There are currently 15 local FCESS program sites. BDS has oversight of the AAs while the Part C State Office provides oversight of the FCESS programs.  
  
NH implements IDEA through state administrative rules, He-M 510 http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/rules/state\_agencies/he-m500.html and He-M 203 http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/rules/state\_agencies/he-m200.html. The rules guide decision making at all levels of the Part C FCESS system. The ten AAs, through their FCESS programs or vendor programss, take referrals, complete evaluations, and provide services to eligible children. Monitoring of the 10 AAs and the 15 local programs is done by BDS, Part C State Office, and BFCS through the data system and site visits.   
  
NH’s statewide data system referred to as NH Leads is used to collect individual child data for federal reporting purposes, quality improvement, & system planning. The NH Leads data system is accessed by local FCESS programs, AAs, Part C State Office, and BDS. Data for 618 and this Annual Performance Report (APR) comes from NH Leads and electorically submitted documentation. Validity and reliability of data is addressed by; (a) assigning responsibility for the entry and accuracy of the information to local administrators, (b) reviewing data for completness prior to generating a report, (c) BDS/Part C State Office review of data to monitor compliance and accuracy, (d) triangulating the data entered into the statewide data system with review of child records and program self-review data, and (e) analyzing data trends to identify patterns or inconsistencies.Technical assistance and training is provided to ensure accurate data entry. BDS maintains a formal agreement with a consultant who is knowledgeable about the data system to provide technical assistance regarding use of the system as well as manages it.  
  
Part C State Office monitoring review teams verify the accuracy of information and data collected through the NH Leads system during record reviews. Record reviews are done for all programs annually. Part C State Office staff use NH Leads to monitor timely entry of data, compliance with federal indicators and the completeness of the data entries. The Part C State Office runs the NH Leads Timely Service and Transition monitoring reports, identifies random samples, and identifies any discovery of noncompliance. If a ‘Discovery’ of noncompliance is identified for any program, the program is provided a 90-day pre-finding correction period from the date reports are distributed to correct any issues and demonstrate 100% compliance. A ‘Discovery’ is identified when there is less than 100% compliance for any one of the indicators reported in the SSP/APR. During the 90-day pre-finding correction period, the Part C State Office pulls subsequent data reports for any program with a discovery of noncompliance to assess the extent a program has corrected the discovery. If it is determined that the program is not in compliance based on the 90-day pre-finding review, a ‘Finding’ of noncompliance is issued. Programs issued a ‘Finding’ of noncompliance are expected to formulate a Corrective Action Plan (CAP). The program staff, director, AA FCESS management, and Part C State Office staff monitor data to ensure that the CAP is successfully completed. The program is required to show 100% compliance within one year of receiving a ‘Finding’. The Part C State Office staff reviews, with the FCESS program director and AA FCESS management, the overall findings of their monitoring activities. Within 3 months of the monitoring assessment, program directors, AA FCESS management, and BDS liaisons receive a formal summary report of the program’s monitoring determinations from the Part C State Office.  
  
The "Know Your Rights" booklet is NH's family friendly description of the He-M 203, complaint resolution process. The booklet is used to enhance and standardize provider explanations of family rights and dispute resolution process and other procedural safeguards. A printed or electronic copy of the “Know Your Rights” booklet is offered and explained to families at each IFSP meeting. During the COVID-19 Pandemic, printed copies of the booklet have been mailed to families. Families can request further information or a copy of the booklet at any time. All FCESS staff are required to read and document understanding of the "Know Your Rights" booklet as part of the "Welcome to FCESS" mandatory training. Program staff, AA staff, and Part C State Office staff are available to assist families in understanding their rights. The Parent Information Center (PIC) and NH Family Voices (NHFV) work collaboratively with families, the Part C State Office, and local FCESS staff to ensure that families throughout the state understand their rights. The majority of complaints in NH are resolved at the local program or AA level. If a complaint reaches the Part C State Office level, families are offered assistance with formal or informal resolution, as they choose. Parents are always given the option of placing a formal complaint immediately, or at any time in the resolution process. A list of trained hearing officers and mediators is maintained by the state office. Hearing officers and mediators are provided with training that orients them to the IDEA Part C laws, He-M 510 and He-M 203 rules, structure of the system, and foundational ideals of the program. AA and FCESS program directors are expected to review procedural safeguards information with their staff annually. Evidence of annual staff trainings is provided to the Part C State Office as part of the annual monitoring process.  
  
State data shows that most children are referred to FCESS by pediatricians and family members. Outreach is provided through multiple venues such as: NH DHHS website, printed materials, local program outreach activities, and collaboration with other early childhood partners. Participation in NH’s Early Childhood Advisory Councel, elevates public awareness of Part C FCESS. NH Part C staff also work closely with and support the NH Watch Me Grow developmental screening network. State and national data shows that NH's public awareness and Child Find systems are effectively reaching potentially eligible children and families. NH Part C FCESS consistently achieves a high level of success in this area when compared to the national average.

**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.**

Information about training and technical assistance (TA), designed to address; (a) concerns, (b) changes, (c) updates, (d) missing data, and (e) upcoming reports, etc. is given to AA and local program directors to disseminate to their staff. Contact information for the Bureau of Developmental Services (BDS), Part C State Office staff and other statewide resources are in the FCESS program directory. Contact information is updated quarterly or more often if changes arise and disseminated to all members of the system verbally, in print, and electronically. The statewide program directory is posted on the DHHS FCESS website https://www.dhhs.nh.gov/dcbcs/bds/earlysupport/documents/directory.pdf.   
  
An important element of NH's TA system is the statewide data system which is used to help programs, AAs, and the state lead agency to monitor for compliance and quality. It provides direct service providers and AAs the opportunity to enter, access, and analyze data directly. Data from this system is used for public awareness and ongoing quality improvement, as well as compliance monitoring. Individualized training and coaching is available to all FCESS staff through the Part C State Office, by request, or when there is a determination of need.   
  
Statewide training and TA is developed with input from relevant stakeholders. Information about how to access TA is regularly articulated to staff at all levels of the system through verbal, printed, and electronic means. System training is articulated in the state rules, area agency/BDS contracts, and formal written guidance.  
  
Targeted TA is provided when a need is identified or when requested. Statewide training is available to increase knowledge of requirements through online modules, site visits, quarterly meetings, reoccurring training, or individualized coaching.   
  
Requests for TA are responded to promptly and collaboratively. State leadership works collaboratively with local programs to maintain system quality and consistency. There is a focus on data based decision making, peer discussion, and implementation of effective practices. State leadership, area agency staff, local program staff, and other early childhood partners regularly share information and developments in our state through; (a) in person conversation, (b) documentation, (c) email, (d) phone, (e) group work, (f) shared access to e-studio documents, (g) data reports, (h) data displays, (i) stakeholder meetings, and (j) committee work.

**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.**

The current comprehensive system of professional development (CSPD) is aligned with the Part C FCESS system strategic plan and other early childhood initiatives. Each program in the NH FCESS system is, by state rule, engaged in a continuous quality improvement planning process. System capacity for ongoing training and coaching support has been improved through the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) process in collaboration with Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA), The Center of IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy), and other OSEP affiliated technical assistance partners. Part C FCESS in NH is engaged in quality improvement initiatives related to the SSIP: Diversity & Cultural Competence (D&CC), Child Outcome Summary (COS), and Sustainable Early Engagement for Change (SEE Change). State Level Leadership teams include technical support, staff, and other stakeholders. These groups work together to plan, implement, evaluate, and adjust the SSIP initiatives.  
1) Initial D&CC training was completed by all FCESS programs in FFY16. This training continues to be provided two to three times a year for new FCESS staff, statewide, as a requirement to be completed within the first year of hire.   
2) All NH FCESS programs completed the COS training during FFY17. This training continues to be provided two to three times a year for new FCESS staff, statewide, as a requirement to be completed within the first year of hire.   
3) Work on the SEE Change Project to improve child and family engagement through the Division of Early Childhood (DEC) Recommended Practices continues. During this FFY19 reporting period, three local programs completed trainings and began implementation. Data is being collected to evaluate the effects of increased family engagement on child outcomes through the SSIP.   
  
The Part C FCESS system in NH is engaged in improvement activities in addition to the SSIP work. Stakeholders are key partners in the development and monitoring of these improvement activities. Stakeholders include but are not limited to state staff, local staff, Parent Information Center (PIC), Bureau of Family Centered Services (BFCS), national technical assistance personnel, child and family advocates, Bureau of Developmental Services management, Office of Health Equity, and early childhood system partners. Work groups comprised of Part C State Office staff and stakeholders are engaged in system improvement, planning, and evaluation related to; (a) improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the data system, (b) improving implementation of supports for all children in the FCESS system (c) fiscal planning, (d) statewide consistency of effort, (e) efficiency of monitoring, and (g) authentic integration of stakeholder input with lead agency decision making. FCESS staff at the state, Area Agency, and local program levels participate in work to inform other systems such as Early Hearing Detection and Intervention (EHDI), Home Visiting, child care, policy, funding, and more.  
  
At the state level, funds are designated annually for training and technical assistance, through the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) budget. Line items within the current annual budget identify SSIP initiatives and current areas of system improvement, to bolster implementation and sustainability of the efforts.  
  
"Welcome to Early Supports and Services" (WESS) orientation is scheduled several times per year. NH state rule mandates that all new staff must review informational modules, review information with their supervisor, and attend a full day wraparound training within 6 months of hire. During the COVID-19 Pandemic, the full day training has been provided virtually in a four hour session. Faculty for this training includes parents who have experienced FCESS services in NH, program directors, Part C State Office staff, Area Agency staff, and a facilitator.  
  
The Part C State Office staff meets with new program directors within the first six months of hire to orient them to requirements and expectations of their new role in the system. An Orientation Manual for New Directors was completed this year to include He-M 510 and He-M 203 rules, guidance documents, helpful links to ECTA and DaSy, and more. Quarterly meetings for local FCESS staff also include training and collaborative work. Qualifications and training expectations are documented in the state rules for Part C NH, He-M 510.   
  
Professional Comprehensive Development System also Supports  
1) Training funds have been distributed in Area Agencies contracts and identified to be used for FCESS staff training reimbursement. A training tracker was developed and distributed to the local FCESS programs to ensure funds have been used for training staff in the area of their choice.  
2) Early Intervention Specialist Certification provides a clear career path for FCESS staff. For more information regarding Early Intervention Specialist Certification. Validators for this certification are coordinated by the Part C State Office.  
3) Mentorship opportunities are coordinated by the Part C State Office. This arrangement provides FCESS staff with the opportunity for one to one mentorships and topical mentorships, based on the needs of staff and system.  
4) Part C State Office staff, area agencies, and FCESS program staff share responsibility for maintaining quality CSPD opportunities and ensuring that the needs of families, staff, and system are met.  
5) Part C State Office staff work collaboratively with other state agencies to assess data and generate initiatives, strategies, and training opportunities that support the broad range of personnel development. Collaborations this past year included Pyramid Model Statewide system planning, statewide systems work with; (a) NH Council l for Thriving Children (b) NH Association on Infant Mental Health (NHAIMH), (c) Partners in Health (PIH), (d) Office of Health Equity (OHE), (e) Parent Information Center (PIC), (f) New Hampshire Family Voices (NHFV), (g) NH’s Title V programs, (h) New Hampshire Department of Education (NH DOE) and (i) other systems that benefit children and families.

**Stakeholder Involvement:**

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

The Part C State Office intentionally engages stakeholder groups. Groups are created and those chosen who are interested in or affected by significant decisions regarding the Part C System are invited to participate. Stakeholders in NH include (a) families, (b) providers, (c) Area Agencies (AAs), (d) other early childhood programs, (e) advocates, and (f) other programs serving children and their families, including but not limited to programs in areas of education, family support, and health.   
  
The Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) membership reflects federal membership requirements. Although there are some vacancies in the appointed membership that the ICC is working to fill, it is well attended by the current members. The ICC has had difficulty recruiting family members. Families are supported to participate on the ICC by reimbursement for mileage and child care to participate in meetings, work groups, and other ICC activities. Families are also supported for their participations in "Welcome to ESS" (WESS) orientation, and other times when stakeholder input may be collected. Distance participation is available through the use of technology, video conferencing, email, public hearing, and phone calls. NH is currently working on ICC family recruitment and documents to explain the importance and purpose of the ICC.  
  
Stakeholder input is gathered through stakeholder activities such as (a) group email discussions, (b) face to face meetings, (c) conference calls, and (d) web workshops to enhance decision making for the statewide system. The primary stakeholder meetings are the Quarterly FCESS Meetings and the ICC meetings which typically convene every other month. However, due to the COVID-19 Pandemic during FFY19, ICC meetings were rescheduled and moved to all virtual. Part C FCESS state and local staff participate in public awareness activities, organizations, councils, and committees as stakeholders to give and gather input throughout the year. Annual Family Outcome Surveys help the Part C system to gather family input. Strong partnership with New Hampshire Family Voices (NHFV) and Parent Information Center (PIC) enable the state staff to gather family input through their networks.   
  
The Part C State Office staff held stakeholder meetings with ICC on December 4, 2020 and FCESS Quarterly on December 9, 2020. These meetings included review of Indicator 3 data analysis and discussions of setting FFY20 targets. Both stakeholder groups agreed the decrease and slippage in outcome data for Indicator 3 was impacted by the statewide training. Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic and limited capacity during FFY19, both stakeholder groups also agreed to maintain FFY19 targets and develop new baseline and targets for FFY20 reporting. NH Part C State Office will be engaging stakeholders throughout the upcoming year in data analysis meetings for setting baselines and projecting yearly targets for all indicators in the upcoming SSP/APR FFY20 – 25 package.

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

YES

**Reporting to the Public:**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2018 performance of each EIS Program located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State’s submission of its FFY 2018 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State’s SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2018 APR in 2020, is available.**

Information about state system components and how to access services is widely available and understood by providers, families, and the general public. NH FCESS Part C staff assess the effectiveness of program outreach through qualitative and quantitative data. Child Find activities are conducted at the local and state levels. Local and state level partnerships are valued and cultivated by ongoing outreach and engagement.   
  
Information about NH’s Part C FCESS system is written in contracts, formal guidance documents, and state rules. These state rules, the Part C grant, the APR, ICC notes, and public reports are posted on the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) FCESS website and distributed widely to stakeholders. Distribution of reports is done electronically, by mail, and in person. The ICC is kept aware of Part C system activities and performance.   
  
The website contains documents and information to inform stakeholders and the broader public about the status of the Part C FCESS system in NH. The website also contains links to associated information that may be relevant to staff, stakeholders, and the broader public. The SSP/APR report contains program level data for public viewing of individual programs. The APR, the Part C Grant, and the SSIP reports are posted on the website immediately following OSEP approval.   
  
Information about the state system and how to access services is advertised through all mediums including, but not limited to, the state DHHS website FCESS page, local program websites and outreach activities, printed materials, and state partnerships. Watch Me Grow, NHFV, and PIC assist in broadening the public’s understanding of the system components, purpose, and how to access services. Information about the FCESS system, services, performance, and rules is also communicated during collaboration meetings and activities with other early childhood entities, during monitoring, and at conferences and other public meetings. Part C State Office and local FCESS staff help stakeholders to understand the He-M 510 rules for the Part C FCESS system at collaborative meetings, with targeted materials and discussion, and through planned and monitored interactions with families. The "Know Your Rights,” "Child Outcomes,” "Transition Blue Books," IFSPs, and other forms help staff to clearly and consistently communicate the rules governing the Part C FCESS system in NH.   
  
The State Performance Plan (SPP) Annual Performance Report (APR) for each monitoring period is posted on the DHHS Lead Agency website on the FCESS page no later than 120 days following OSEP approval. The performance of each program is incorporated into the APR for public reporting. The FFY18 APR annual report to the public, reporting on the period of July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019 was made available electronically, through e-mail, and was posted on the FCESS website: https://www.dhhs.nh.gov/dcbcs/bds/earlysupport/index.htm. Hard copies were also available from the Part C State Office by contacting Kathy Gray via phone 603-271-3783 or email Kathleen.gray@dhhs.nh.gov. The report was discussed at all stakeholder meetings.  
  
The Part C State Office staff disseminates the APR report, other performance information, training information, and updates electronically and at quarterly meetings, to FCESS program directors and representatives of the AAs. FCESS program directors then disseminate information to direct service providers and families, as appropriate. In addition, notice is given to the media for statewide distribution specifying where copies can be obtained. Copies of materials are available through BDS, the Part C State Office, New Hampshire Family Voices (NHFV), and the Parent Information Center (NH PIC). Local program data for compliance indicators is included in the FFY18 APR.

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP’s coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State’s capacity to improve its SiMR data.  
  
The State's IDEA Part C determination for both 2019 and 2020 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2020 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance.  
The State must report, with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

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

## Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2019 and 2020 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to sections 616(e)(1) and 642 of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 303.704(a), OSEP's June 23, 2020 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.  
  
The State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) submitted to the Secretary its annual report that is required under IDEA section 641(e)(1)(D) and 34 C.F.R. §303.604(c). The SICC noted it has elected to support the State lead agency’s submission of its SPP/APR as its annual report in lieu of submitting a separate report. OSEP accepts the SICC form, which will not be posted publicly with the State’s SPP/APR documents.

## Intro - Required Actions

# Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Family Service Plans (IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Include the State’s criteria for “timely” receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services, including the reasons for delays.

**Instructions**

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select early intervention service (EIS) programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. States report in both the numerator and denominator under Indicator 1 on the number of children for whom the State ensured the timely initiation of new services identified on the IFSP. Include the timely initiation of new early intervention services from both initial IFSPs and subsequent IFSPs. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

The State’s timeliness measure for this indicator must be either: (1) a time period that runs from when the parent consents to IFSP services; or (2) the IFSP initiation date (established by the IFSP Team, including the parent).

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child’s record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in the Office of Special Education Programs’ (OSEP’s) response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 88.80% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | NVR | 97.67% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner** | **Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 211 | 221 | 97.67% | 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.***
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**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).**

New Hampshire's (NH’s) Family Centered Early Supports and Services (FCESS) criteria for compliance with Indicator 1, Timely Services, is defined as any early therapeutic intervention service identified in the initial IFSP and any additional early therapeutic intervention services identified in subsequent IFSPs, consented to by the parent, are initiated by the projected start date that is identified in the IFSP at the time of parent consent signature. The projected start date is agreed upon and identified by the IFSP team, which includes the family/parent when developing the IFSP. The projected start is expected to be no more than 30 days from the IFSP consent date unless documented family circumstances requires more than 30 days.

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

State monitoring

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

All 15 NH Part C FCESS local programs are monitored using the NH Leads state database system throughout the year. To verify that information in the data system is valid and reliable, a randomly selected sample from the Timely Service Monitoring report (including the months of July – November) was reviewed by the Part C State Office monitoring team for each local program. The Timely Service Monitoring report indicates the projected start date of therapeutic intervention services and the actual start date the services identified in the IFSP were provided. A random sample for each local program is defined as 5% of the total number of children with IFSPs served by the program during the previous fiscal year or a minimum of 10 records. If a discovery of noncompliance is identified in the initial data report, local programs have a 90-day pre-finding correction period to provide documented acceptable circumstances or demonstrate 100% compliance with Indicator 1. If 100% compliance is not demonstrated within the 90-day pre-finding correction period, a finding of noncompliance is issued. The program with a finding of noncompliance must then engage in a corrective action plan process that includes one year of quarterly monitoring. Technical assistance is provided to local programs by the Part C State Office staff to ensure successful correction of noncompliance.  
  
Targets for Indicator 1 is 100% compliance for all local FCESS programs in NH. The state included in its calculation the number of children for whom the state identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record. NH met its target of 100% compliance for FFY19 reporting through review of NH Leads data system and review of individual child documentation submitted and verified for Indicator 1.  
  
In the data report sample of 221 records for FFY19 reporting, 211 were found to have received timely therapeutic intervention services and 10 had documented exceptional family circumstances (EFC) that contributed to the delay of timely receipt of services. The Part C State Office monitoring team verified EFC through review of electronically submitted case notes and phone logs. For the 10 children whose services were delayed, documentation of EFC included; parent not returning calls to schedule, families cancelled timely scheduled visit and requesting to reschedule beyond the projected start date, family no-show timely scheduled visits, and child hospitalization. Although delayed, all services were provided with parental consent at a time that was convenient and agreed upon by the family. Therefore, 100% [(211+10) = 221] of children were considered to have received timely early therapeutic intervention services.

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

NH Part C State Office was unable to conduct onsite monitoring for FFY19 due to the COVID-19 Pandemic and the State of Emergency Stay At Home order issued on 3/13/20. The Part C State Office directed local programs to electronically submit documentation from the children's’ records for the random sample identified in the program’s Timely Service Monitoring report. The Part C State Office monitoring team reviewed documentation that was submitted for verification of compliance. COVID-19 Pandemic did not impact NH’s Indicator 1 data collection or performance this reporting year since the sample time period used for reporting FFY19 data was prior to when the pandemic and state emergency hit in March 2020.  
  
Noncompliance reported in FFY18 State Performance Plan (SSP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) for Indicator 1, Timely Services, included five therapeutic intervention services provided beyond the projected start date due to within program control at three local programs including Community Bridges (CB) at 96% compliance with one delayed service, Easterseals07 (ES07) at 94% compliance with one delayed service, and Waypoint (WP) at 70% compliance with three delayed services. Although services were provided late, beyond the projected start date, all families and children did receive services identified in their IFSPs. These three local programs provided staff training and achieved 100% compliance in the subsequent pre-finding data reports within the pre-finding 90-day correction period prior to the issuance of findings for noncompliance.  
  
In order to verify that the three local programs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for Indicator 1, the state reviewed subsequent pre-finding data from NHLeads, the state’s Part C data system, during the 90-day pre-finding period for each program. The subsequent data report for CB included 24 records which showed all 24 services were provided prior to the projected start date. The subsequent data report for ES07 included 16 records which showed 13 services were provided prior to the projected start date and 3 services were delayed due to documented exceptional family circumstances. The subsequent data report for WP included 10 records which showed all 10 services were provided prior to the projected start date. To confirm accuracy of the NHLeads data used for verification, local programs were required to submit documentation from the records of these children showing timely service and documentation of exceptional family circumstances if the service was provided beyond the projected start date.  
  
Based on review of the three local program’s subsequent pre-finding data reports and individual child documentation, the Part C State Office determined all three local programs achieved compliance during the 90-day pre-finding correction period prior to the issuance of findings and were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for Indicator 1. Therefore, no findings of noncompliance were issued to either of these three local programs for Indicator 1 in FFY18 due to pre-finding data showing local programs correctly implementing regulatory requirements.   
  
For each local program with a discovery of non-compliance on Indicator 1, the state Part C staff used NHLeads, the state’s Part C data system, and individual child documentation to verify that for each instance of noncompliance involved in the FFY18 APR that the child did receive services identified in their IFSP, though late. The state Part C Office has verified that each local program with noncompliance identified in FFY18 and reported by New Hampshire under this indicator in the FFY18 APR has provided services for each of the five children identified during discovery, although late, and is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

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

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

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

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

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

## 1 - Required Actions

## 1 - State Attachments



# Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State’s 618 data reported in Table 2. If not, explain.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 99.84% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target>= | 98.00% | 98.40% | 98.40% | 98.50% | 98.50% |
| Data | 98.93% | 98.30% | 97.92% | 98.09% | 98.51% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target>= | 98.50% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Part C State Office intentionally engages stakeholder groups. Groups are created and those chosen who are interested in or affected by significant decisions regarding the Part C System are invited to participate. Stakeholders in NH include (a) families, (b) providers, (c) Area Agencies (AAs), (d) other early childhood programs, (e) advocates, and (f) other programs serving children and their families, including but not limited to programs in areas of education, family support, and health.   
  
The Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) membership reflects federal membership requirements. Although there are some vacancies in the appointed membership that the ICC is working to fill, it is well attended by the current members. The ICC has had difficulty recruiting family members. Families are supported to participate on the ICC by reimbursement for mileage and child care to participate in meetings, work groups, and other ICC activities. Families are also supported for their participations in "Welcome to ESS" (WESS) orientation, and other times when stakeholder input may be collected. Distance participation is available through the use of technology, video conferencing, email, public hearing, and phone calls. NH is currently working on ICC family recruitment and documents to explain the importance and purpose of the ICC.  
  
Stakeholder input is gathered through stakeholder activities such as (a) group email discussions, (b) face to face meetings, (c) conference calls, and (d) web workshops to enhance decision making for the statewide system. The primary stakeholder meetings are the Quarterly FCESS Meetings and the ICC meetings which typically convene every other month. However, due to the COVID-19 Pandemic during FFY19, ICC meetings were rescheduled and moved to all virtual. Part C FCESS state and local staff participate in public awareness activities, organizations, councils, and committees as stakeholders to give and gather input throughout the year. Annual Family Outcome Surveys help the Part C system to gather family input. Strong partnership with New Hampshire Family Voices (NHFV) and Parent Information Center (PIC) enable the state staff to gather family input through their networks.   
  
The Part C State Office staff held stakeholder meetings with ICC on December 4, 2020 and FCESS Quarterly on December 9, 2020. These meetings included review of Indicator 3 data analysis and discussions of setting FFY20 targets. Both stakeholder groups agreed the decrease and slippage in outcome data for Indicator 3 was impacted by the statewide training. Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic and limited capacity during FFY19, both stakeholder groups also agreed to maintain FFY19 targets and develop new baseline and targets for FFY20 reporting. NH Part C State Office will be engaging stakeholders throughout the upcoming year in data analysis meetings for setting baselines and projecting yearly targets for all indicators in the upcoming SSP/APR FFY20 – 25 package.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/08/2020 | Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings | 2,053 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/08/2020 | Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs | 2,105 |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings** | **Total number of Infants and toddlers with IFSPs** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2,053 | 2,105 | 98.51% | 98.50% | 97.53% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

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

New Hampshire’s (NH) 618 data for reporting Indicator 2 was gathered from the NH LEADS data system and reported in EMAPS. This 618 child count setting data represents children with active IFSPs at a point in time: December 1, 2019. The target for Indicator 2 services in natural environments FFY19 was 98.50%. The data collected on 12/1/19 indicates 97.53% of children received services in a natural environment. NH did not reach its FFY19 target of 98.50% by 0.97%. FFY19 data also decreased by 0.98% in comparison with FFY18 data. Nine of 15 local programs’ data indicated an increase in the number of families requesting services in other settings due to a variety of family reasons (i.e. change in family work schedule, numerus pets and/or people in the home). Seven local programs showed an average of 0.30% increase and two programs showed an increase of 1.38% and 1.48% of families requesting services be provided in other locations. NH statewide data shows 2.47% of children did not receive services within a natural environment. This has remained consistent in NH with an approximate of 2% over the years.  
  
During FFY19 state monitoring review, a sample of IFSPs (5% or a minimum of 10 children served by each of the 15 local programs during the previous fiscal year) were reviewed for Indicator 2. The FFY19 monitoring review included a total of 221 individual child records. Individual child documentation reviewed verified that 219 of 221 children (99.10%) received services in the natural environment. Two children, less than 1%, did not receive services in the natural environment. The state verified through individual IFSP review that the two children who were not receiving services in the natural environment had a justification and timeline plan to move services back to the natural environment, documented in their IFSPs.   
  
NH Part C State Office was unable to conduct onsite monitoring for FFY19 due to the COVID-19 Pandemic and the State of Emergency Stay At Home order issued on 3/13/20. The Part C State Office directed local programs to electronically submit documentation from the children's’ records for the random sample identified in the program’s Timely Service Monitoring report. The Part C State Office monitoring team reviewed submitted documentation for verification of compliance.  
  
COVID-19 Pandemic did not impact NH’s Indicator 2 data or performance this reporting year since the sample time period used for reporting FFY19 data was prior to when the pandemic and state emergency hit in March 2020.

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

## 2 - Required Actions

## 2 - State Attachments



# 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)**

YES

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Part C State Office intentionally engages stakeholder groups. Groups are created and those chosen who are interested in or affected by significant decisions regarding the Part C System are invited to participate. Stakeholders in NH include (a) families, (b) providers, (c) Area Agencies (AAs), (d) other early childhood programs, (e) advocates, and (f) other programs serving children and their families, including but not limited to programs in areas of education, family support, and health.   
  
The Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) membership reflects federal membership requirements. Although there are some vacancies in the appointed membership that the ICC is working to fill, it is well attended by the current members. The ICC has had difficulty recruiting family members. Families are supported to participate on the ICC by reimbursement for mileage and child care to participate in meetings, work groups, and other ICC activities. Families are also supported for their participations in "Welcome to ESS" (WESS) orientation, and other times when stakeholder input may be collected. Distance participation is available through the use of technology, video conferencing, email, public hearing, and phone calls. NH is currently working on ICC family recruitment and documents to explain the importance and purpose of the ICC.  
  
Stakeholder input is gathered through stakeholder activities such as (a) group email discussions, (b) face to face meetings, (c) conference calls, and (d) web workshops to enhance decision making for the statewide system. The primary stakeholder meetings are the Quarterly FCESS Meetings and the ICC meetings which typically convene every other month. However, due to the COVID-19 Pandemic during FFY19, ICC meetings were rescheduled and moved to all virtual. Part C FCESS state and local staff participate in public awareness activities, organizations, councils, and committees as stakeholders to give and gather input throughout the year. Annual Family Outcome Surveys help the Part C system to gather family input. Strong partnership with New Hampshire Family Voices (NHFV) and Parent Information Center (PIC) enable the state staff to gather family input through their networks.   
  
The Part C State Office staff held stakeholder meetings with ICC on December 4, 2020 and FCESS Quarterly on December 9, 2020. These meetings included review of Indicator 3 data analysis and discussions of setting FFY20 targets. Both stakeholder groups agreed the decrease and slippage in outcome data for Indicator 3 was impacted by the statewide training. Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic and limited capacity during FFY19, both stakeholder groups also agreed to maintain FFY19 targets and develop new baseline and targets for FFY20 reporting. NH Part C State Office will be engaging stakeholders throughout the upcoming year in data analysis meetings for setting baselines and projecting yearly targets for all indicators in the upcoming SSP/APR FFY20 – 25 package.

**Will your separate report be just the at-risk infants and toddlers or aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C?**

Aggregated Performance

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A1** | 2013 | Target>= | 82.79% | 82.89% | 82.99% | 83.09% | 83.09% |
| **A1** | 82.69% | Data | 80.15% | 79.95% | 82.15% | 74.67% | 72.24% |
| **A1 ALL** | 2006 | Target>= |  |  |  | 83.09% | 83.09% |
| **A1 ALL** |  | Data |  |  | 82.32% | 74.71% | 72.11% |
| **A2** | 2013 | Target>= | 71.22% | 71.32% | 71.42% | 71.52% | 71.52% |
| **A2** | 71.12% | Data | 67.00% | 67.84% | 67.13% | 64.06% | 63.88% |
| **A2 ALL** | 2006 | Target>= |  |  |  | 71.52% | 71.52% |
| **A2 ALL** |  | Data |  |  | 67.47% | 64.15% | 63.92% |
| **B1** | 2013 | Target>= | 84.00% | 84.00% | 84.50% | 84.50% | 85.00% |
| **B1** | 85.25% | Data | 84.00% | 84.55% | 84.88% | 79.34% | 73.88% |
| **B1 ALL** | 2006 | Target>= |  |  |  | 84.50% | 85.00% |
| **B1 ALL** |  | Data |  |  | 85.04% | 79.41% | 74.05% |
| **B2** | 2013 | Target>= | 66.98% | 67.00% | 67.10% | 67.20% | 67.20% |
| **B2** | 66.88% | Data | 64.91% | 64.15% | 64.12% | 60.59% | 54.28% |
| **B2 ALL** | 2006 | Target>= |  |  |  | 67.20% | 67.20% |
| **B2 ALL** |  | Data |  |  | 64.34% | 60.65% | 54.53% |
| **C1** | 2013 | Target>= | 86.47% | 86.57% | 86.67% | 86.77% | 86.77% |
| **C1** | 86.37% | Data | 85.81% | 83.33% | 85.41% | 81.10% | 77.33% |
| **C1 ALL** | 2006 | Target>= |  |  |  | 86.77% | 86.77% |
| **C1 ALL** |  | Data |  |  | 85.59% | 81.22% | 77.11% |
| **C2** | 2013 | Target>= | 72.59% | 72.69% | 72.75% | 72.85% | 72.85% |
| **C2** | 72.49% | Data | 70.63% | 70.34% | 69.32% | 63.97% | 60.22% |
| **C2 ALL** | 2006 | Target>= |  |  |  | 72.85% | 72.85% |
| **C2 ALL** |  | Data |  |  | 69.56% | 64.31% | 60.32% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A1 >= | 82.70% |
| Target A1 ALL >= | 82.70% |
| Target A2 >= | 71.13% |
| Target A2 ALL >= | 71.13% |
| Target B1 >= | 85.26% |
| Target B1 ALL >= | 85.26% |
| Target B2 >= | 68.89% |
| Target B2 ALL >= | 68.89% |
| Target C1 >= | 86.38% |
| Target C1 ALL >= | 86.38% |
| Target C2 >= | 72.50% |
| Target C2 ALL >= | 72.50% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

1,327

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

| **Not including at-risk infants and toddlers** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 0 | 0.00% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 294 | 22.55% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 178 | 13.65% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 383 | 29.37% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 449 | 34.43% |

| **Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 0 | 0.00% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 302 | 22.76% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 182 | 13.72% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 387 | 29.16% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 456 | 34.36% |

| **Not including at-risk infants and toddlers** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 561 | 855 | 72.24% | 82.70% | 65.61% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| 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 | 832 | 1,304 | 63.88% | 71.13% | 63.80% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable**

Indicator 3, Outcome A, Summary Statement 1 (A1) data were reported, first, for all infants and toddlers with IFSPs exiting the New Hampshire (NH) Part C FCESS program, not including 23 of those in the “At-Risk” eligibility category. Based on the total (excluding “At-Risk”) of 1,304 infants and toddlers with IFSPs, the percentage of those who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program was 65.61% for A1 measuring positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships). NH did not meet the set target of 82.70%. These results were below target by 17.09%. The FFY18 to FFY19 slippage for A1 (excluding “At-Risk”) was 6.30%. While Summary Statement 1 was below NH’s target, the percentage found in the subset excluding “At-Risk” was slightly above to the national percentage of 65% found in FFY 2018 Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center & Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (2020) IDEA Child Outcomes Highlights for FFY2018. Retrieved from http://ectacenter.org/eco/pages/childoutcomeshighlights.asp.  
  
All 15 New Hampshire (NH) Family Centered Early Supports and Services (FCESS) local program staff engaged in a statewide Child Outcome Summary (COS) training between September 2017 and May 2018. Data reported in this FFY19 SSP/APR reflects NH’s third year post training and second year post statewide implementation The training reinforced the COS rating criteria and addressed a number of common misconceptions that had previously led to inaccuracies in ratings following several predictable patterns.The baseline and targets for Indicator 3 Outcome A Summary Statement 1 were set based on data prior to this statewide professional development event. Following a statewide system event of the COS training, slippage from these original targets continues to be observed. This slippage has been expected; data slippage is consistent with changes in practice that would occur when practitioners better understand and more accurately apply COS rating criteria. Current performance of outcomes data are consistent with those expected from more accurate data. We understand through Implementation Science and Theory of Change that, following a system wide change event, data typically reflects a decrease in outcomes. Recovery can take 2-3 years post implementation before a demonstration of effective change is evident.  
  
New Hampshire (NH) engaged in monthly data analysis with national technical assistance (TA) that included the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy Center) and a Principal Education Researcher at the Center for Learning and Development / SRI Education. The data analysis provided evidence that NH’s COS data showed predictable changes before and after the COS training was implemented. Findings from these analyses were consistent with the assertion that data reported in FFY19 are more accurate after the statewide COS training than before it and that training was a major factor in the data changes and slippage that occurred. Through data analysis examining all children served in NH, we examined the distribution of entry ratings for Outcome A before and after the statewide COS training; these analyses showed an increase in children receiving ratings of a four or five at entry after the training. Ratings of four and five are indicative of children demonstrating some skills at age expectation and the percentages of children entering at these levels were consistent with what we would expect given the children NH serves. We also examined patterns in entry ratings and progress categories before and after the training. In this work, we found a statistically significat change in the distributions of COS ratings after the training. Data analysis confirmed after the training more children had ratings who stayed the same between entry and exit and fewer children made notably large rating increases (3 points or more). Again, these findings are consistent with data that are more accurate after the COS training event and also would result in lower values on Summary Statement 1. These data also help explain the slippage in Outcome A1 for infants and toddlers in New Hampshire, excluding those in the “At-Risk” eligibility category. The FFY19 data analysis also supports the assertion that the change in statewide performance data was in large part a result of the training. A final piece of evidence provided by ECTA and DaSy, State Child Outcomes Data Profile New Hampshire Part C 2018, showed that NH statewide performance has moved from being more than a standard deviation above the national average in Outcome A1 to closer to the national average after NH’s statewide COS training which is indicative of increased data quality. Therefore, while the state acknowledges that the data presented do not meet initial targets and did show slippage, these data are actually a better reflection of the functioning and progress of children who have been served in NH all along. NH’s outcomes data collection system is becoming stronger and the observed decreases result from those changes rather than from lower quality services being provided to children and families.

| **Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 569 | 871 | 72.11% | 82.70% | 65.33% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| 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 | 843 | 1,327 | 63.92% | 71.13% | 63.53% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for A1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable**

Indicator 3, Outcome A, Summary Statement 1 (A1) data were reported, secondly, for all infants and toddlers with IFSPs exiting the New Hampshire (NH) Part C FCESS program including 23 of those in the “At-Risk” eligibility category. Based on the total of 1,327 infants and toddlers with IFSPs, the percentage of those who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program was 65.33% for A1 measuring positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships). NH did not meet the set target of 82.70%. These results were below target by 17.37%. The FFY18 to FFY19 slippage for A1 (including “At-Risk”) was 6.78%. While Summary Statement 1 was below NH’s target, the percentage found in NH’s at risk subset was very close to the national percentage of 65% found in FFY 2018 Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center & Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (2020) IDEA Child Outcomes Highlights for FFY2018. Retrieved from http://ectacenter.org/eco/pages/childoutcomeshighlights.asp.  
  
All 15 New Hampshire (NH) Family Centered Early Supports and Services (FCESS) local program staff engaged in a statewide Child Outcome Summary (COS) training between September 2017 and May 2018. Data reported in this FFY19 SSP/APR reflects NH’s third year post training and second year post statewide implementation The training reinforced the COS rating criteria and addressed a number of common misconceptions that had previously led to inaccuracies in ratings following several predictable patterns.The baseline and targets for Indicator 3 Outcome A Summary Statement 1 were set based on data prior to this statewide professional development event. Following a statewide system event of the COS training, slippage from these original targets continues to be observed. This slippage has been expected; data slippage is consistent with changes in practice that would occur when practitioners better understand and more accurately apply COS rating criteria. Current performance of outcomes data are consistent with those expected from more accurate data. We understand through Implementation Science and Theory of Change that, following a system wide change event, data typically reflects a decrease in outcomes. Recovery can take 2-3 years post implementation before a demonstration of effective change is evident.  
  
New Hampshire (NH) engaged in monthly data analysis with national technical assistance (TA) that included the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy Center) and a Principal Education Researcher at the Center for Learning and Development / SRI Education. The data analysis provided evidence that NH’s COS data showed predictable changes before and after the COS training was implemented. Findings from these analyses were consistent with the assertion that data reported in FFY19 are more accurate after the statewide COS training than before it and that training was a major factor in the data changes and slippage that occurred. Through data analysis examining all children served in NH, we examined the distribution of entry ratings for Outcome A before and after the statewide COS training; these analyses showed an increase in children receiving ratings of a four or five at entry after the training. Ratings of four and five are indicative of children demonstrating some skills at age expectation and the percentages of children entering at these levels were consistent with what we would expect given the children NH serves. We also examined patterns in entry ratings and progress categories before and after the training. In this work, we found a statistically significate change in the distributions of COS ratings after the training. Data analysis confirmed after the training more children had ratings who stayed the same between entry and exit and fewer children made notably large rating increases (3 points or more). Again, these findings are consistent with data that are more accurate after the COS training event and also would result in lower values on Summary Statement 1. These data also help explain the slippage in Outcome A1 for infants and toddlers in NH, including those in the “At-Risk” eligibility category. The FFY19 data analysis also supports the assertion that the change in statewide performance data was in large part a result of the training. A final piece of evidence provided by ECTA and DaSy, State Child Outcomes Data Profile New Hampshire Part C 2018, showed that NH statewide performance has moved from being more than a standard deviation above the national average in Outcome A1 to closer to the national average after NH’s statewide COS training which is indicative of increased data quality. Therefore, while the state acknowledges that the data presented do not meet initial targets and did show slippage, these data are actually a better reflection of the functioning and progress of children who have been served in NH all along. NH’s outcomes data collection system is becoming stronger and the observed decreases result from those changes rather than from lower quality services being provided to children and families.

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

| **Not including at-risk infants and toddlers** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 0 | 0.00% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 365 | 27.99% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 238 | 18.25% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 499 | 38.27% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 202 | 15.49% |

| **Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 0 | 0.00% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 375 | 28.26% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 240 | 18.09% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 506 | 38.13% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 206 | 15.52% |

| **Not including at-risk infants and toddlers** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 737 | 1,102 | 73.88% | 85.26% | 66.88% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| 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 | 701 | 1,304 | 54.28% | 68.89% | 53.76% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable**

Indicator 3, Outcome B, Summary Statement 1 (B1) data were reported, first, for all infants and toddlers with IFSPs exiting the New Hampshire (NH) Part C FCESS program, not including 23 of those in the “At-Risk” eligibility category. Based on the total of 1,304 infants and toddlers with IFSPs, the percentage of those (excluding “At-Risk”) who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program was 66.88% for B1 measuring acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication). NH did not meet the set target of 82.26%. These results were below target by 15.38%. The FFY18 to FFY19 slippage for B1 (excluding “At-Risk”) was 7.00%. While Summary Statement 1 was quite a bit below NH’s target, the percentage found in NH’s not at risk subset was reasonably close to the national percentage of 74% found in FFY 2018 Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center & Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (2020) IDEA Child Outcomes Highlights for FFY2018. Retrieved from http://ectacenter.org/eco/pages/childoutcomeshighlights.asp.  
  
All 15 New Hampshire (NH) Family Centered Early Supports and Services (FCESS) local program staff engaged in a statewide Child Outcome Summary (COS) training between September 2017 and May 2018. Data reported in this FFY19 SSP/APR reflects NH’s third year post training and second year post statewide implementation The training reinforced the COS rating criteria and addressed a number of common misconceptions that had previously led to inaccuracies in ratings following several predictable patterns.The baseline and targets for Indicator 3 Outcome B Summary Statement 1 were set based on data prior to this statewide professional development event. Following a statewide system event of the COS training, slippage from these original targets continues to be observed. This slippage has been expected; data slippage is consistent with changes in practice that would occur when practitioners better understand and more accurately apply COS rating criteria. Current performance of outcomes data are consistent with those expected from more accurate data. We understand through Implementation Science and Theory of Change that, following a system wide change event, data typically reflects a decrease in outcomes. Recovery can take 2-3 years post implementation before a demonstration of effective change is evident.  
  
New Hampshire (NH) engaged in monthly data analysis with national technical assistance (TA) that included the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy Center) and a Principal Education Researcher at the Center for Learning and Development / SRI Education. The data analysis provided evidence that NH’s COS data showed predictable changes before and after the COS training was implemented. Findings from these analyses were consistent with the assertion that data reported in FFY19 are more accurate after the statewide COS training than before it and that training was a major factor in the data changes and slippage that occurred. Through data analysis examining all children served in NH, we examined the distribution of entry ratings for Outcome B before and after the statewide COS training; these analyses showed an increase in children receiving ratings of a four or five at entry after the training. Ratings of four and five are indicative of children demonstrating some skills at age expectation and the percentages of children entering at these levels were consistent with what we would expect given the children NH serves. We also examined patterns in entry ratings and progress categories before and after the training. In this work, we found a statistically significate change in the distributions of COS ratings after the training. Data analysis confirmed after the training more children had ratings who stayed the same between entry and exit and fewer children made notably large rating increases (3 points or more). Again, these findings are consistent with data that are more accurate after the COS training event and also would result in lower values on Summary Statement 1. These data also help explain the slippage in Outcome B1 for infants and toddlers in NH, excluding those in the “At-Risk” eligibility category. The FFY19 data analysis also supports the assertion that the change in statewide performance data was in large part a result of the training. A final piece of evidence provided by ECTA and DaSy, State Child Outcomes Data Profile New Hampshire Part C 2018, showed that NH statewide performance has moved from being more than a standard deviation above the national average in Outcome B1 to closer to the national average after NH’s statewide COS training which is indicative of increased data quality. Therefore, while the state acknowledges that the data presented do not meet initial targets and did show slippage, these data are actually a better reflection of the functioning and progress of children who have been served in NH all along. NH’s outcomes data collection system is becoming stronger and the observed decreases result from those changes rather than from lower quality services being provided to children and families

| **Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 746 | 1,121 | 74.05% | 85.26% | 66.55% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| 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 | 712 | 1,327 | 54.53% | 68.89% | 53.65% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for B1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable**

Indicator 3, Outcome B, Summary Statement 1 (B1) data was reported, secondly, for all infants and toddlers with IFSPs exiting the New Hampshire (NH) Part C FCESS program, including 23 of those in the “At-Risk” eligibility category. Based on the total of 1,327 infants and toddlers with IFSPs, the percentage of those who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program was 66.55% for B1 measuring acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication). NH did not meet the set target of 82.26% for B1. These results were below target by 15.71%. The FFY18 to FFY19 slippage for B1 (including “At-Risk”) was 7.50%. While Summary Statement 1 was quite a bit below NH’s target, the percentage found in all children in New Hampshire (including “At-Risk”) was reasonably close to the national percentage of 74% found in FFY 2018 Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center & Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (2020) IDEA Child Outcomes Highlights for FFY2018. Retrieved from http://ectacenter.org/eco/pages/childoutcomeshighlights.asp.  
  
All 15 New Hampshire (NH) Family Centered Early Supports and Services (FCESS) local program staff engaged in a statewide Child Outcome Summary (COS) training between September 2017 and May 2018. Data reported in this FFY19 SSP/APR reflects NH’s third year post training and second year post statewide implementation The training reinforced the COS rating criteria and addressed a number of common misconceptions that had previously led to inaccuracies in ratings following several predictable patterns.The baseline and targets for Indicator 3 Outcome B Summary Statement 1 were set based on data prior to this statewide professional development event. Following a statewide system event of the COS training, slippage from these original targets continues to be observed. This slippage has been expected; data slippage is consistent with changes in practice that would occur when practitioners better understand and more accurately apply COS rating criteria. Current performance of outcomes data are consistent with those expected from more accurate data. We understand through Implementation Science and Theory of Change that, following a system wide change event, data typically reflects a decrease in outcomes. Recovery can take 2-3 years post implementation before a demonstration of effective change is evident.  
  
New Hampshire (NH) engaged in monthly data analysis with national technical assistance (TA) that included the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy Center) and a Principal Education Researcher at the Center for Learning and Development / SRI Education. The data analysis provided evidence that NH’s COS data showed predictable changes before and after the COS training was implemented. Findings from these analyses were consistent with the assertion that data reported in FFY19 are more accurate after the statewide COS training than before it and that training was a major factor in the data changes and slippage that occurred. Through data analysis examining all children served in NH, we examined the distribution of entry ratings for Outcome B before and after the statewide COS training; these analyses showed an increase in children receiving ratings of a four or five at entry after the training. Ratings of four and five are indicative of children demonstrating some skills at age expectation and the percentages of children entering at these levels were consistent with what we would expect given the children NH serves. We also examined patterns in entry ratings and progress categories before and after the training. In this work, we found a statistically significate change in the distributions of COS ratings after the training. Data analysis confirmed after the training more children had ratings who stayed the same between entry and exit and fewer children made notably large rating increases (3 points or more). Again, these findings are consistent with data that are more accurate after the COS training event and also would result in lower values on Summary Statement 1. These data also help explain the slippage in Outcome B1 for all infants and toddlers in NH, including those in the “At-Risk” eligibility category. The FFY19 data analysis also supports the assertion that the change in statewide performance data was in large part a result of the training. A final piece of evidence provided by ECTA and DaSy, State Child Outcomes Data Profile New Hampshire Part C 2018, showed that NH statewide performance has moved from being more than a standard deviation above the national average in Outcome B1 to closer to the national average after NH’s statewide COS training which is indicative of increased data quality. Therefore, while the state acknowledges that the data presented do not meet initial targets and did show slippage, these data are actually a better reflection of the functioning and progress of children who have been served in NH all along. NH’s outcomes data collection system is becoming stronger and the observed decreases result from those changes rather than from lower quality services being provided to children and families.

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

| **Not including at-risk infants and toddlers** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 0 | 0.00% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 328 | 25.15% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 233 | 17.87% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 568 | 43.56% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 175 | 13.42% |

| **Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 0 | 0.00% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 338 | 25.47% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 237 | 17.86% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 574 | 43.26% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 178 | 13.41% |

| **Not including at-risk infants and toddlers** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 801 | 1,129 | 77.33% | 86.38% | 70.95% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| 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 | 743 | 1,304 | 60.22% | 72.50% | 56.98% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable**

Indicator 3, Outcome C, Summary Statement 1 (C1) data were reported, first, for all infants and toddlers with IFSPs exiting the New Hampshire (NH) Part C FCESS program, not including 23 of those in the “At-Risk” eligibility category. Based on the total of 1,304 infants and toddlers with IFSPs, the percentage of those (excluding “At-Risk”) who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program was 70.95% for C1 measuring use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. NH did not meet the set target of 86.38% for C1. These results were below target by 15.43%. The FFY18 to FFY19 slippage for C1 (excluding “At-Risk”) was 6.38%. While Summary Statement 1 was quite a bit below NH’s target, the percentage found in NH’s at risk subset was reasonably close to the national percentage of 76% found in FFY 2018 Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center & Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (2020) IDEA Child Outcomes Highlights for FFY2018. Retrieved from http://ectacenter.org/eco/pages/childoutcomeshighlights.asp.   
  
  
All 15 New Hampshire (NH) Family Centered Early Supports and Services (FCESS) local program staff engaged in a statewide Child Outcome Summary (COS) training between September 2017 and May 2018. Data reported in this FFY19 SSP/APR reflects NH’s third year post training and second year post statewide implementation The training reinforced the COS rating criteria and addressed a number of common misconceptions that had previously led to inaccuracies in ratings following several predictable patterns.The baseline and targets for Indicator 3 Outcome C Summary Statement 1 were set based on data prior to this statewide professional development event. Following a statewide system event of the COS training, slippage from these original targets continues to be observed. This slippage has been expected; data slippage is consistent with changes in practice that would occur when practitioners better understand and more accurately apply COS rating criteria. Current performance of outcomes data are consistent with those expected from more accurate data. We understand through Implementation Science and Theory of Change that, following a system wide change event, data typically reflects a decrease in outcomes. Recovery can take 2-3 years post implementation before a demonstration of effective change is evident.  
  
New Hampshire (NH) engaged in monthly data analysis with national technical assistance (TA) that included the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy Center) and a Principal Education Researcher Center for Learning and Development / SRI Education. The data analysis provided evidence that NH’s COS data showed predictable changes before and after the COS training was implemented. Findings from these analyses were consistent with the assertion that data reported in FFY19 are more accurate after the statewide COS training and that training was a major factor in the data changes and slippage that occurred. Through data analysis including all children served in NH, we examined the distribution of entry ratings for Outcome C before and after the statewide COS training; these analyses showed an increase in children receiving ratings of a four or five at entry after the training. Outcome C also showed a decrease of 3% in the percentage of children rated as a 6 or a 7 at entry in FFY 18 and again in FFY 19. Ratings of four or five are indicative of children demonstrating some skills at age expectation, but also a mix of skills that are not age expected. Lower ratings of 6 and 7 are indicative of somewhat fewer children functioning fully at age expectatation on Outcome C at entry. The percentages of children entering at these levels were consistent with what we would expect given the children NH serves. They are also consistent with a stronger understanding of Outcome C. The data follow a pattern that suggests practitioners are basing ratings on the full breadth of content for using appropriate behaviors to meet needs rather than simply focusing on motor skills to meet needs. We also examined patterns in entry ratings and progress categories before and after the training. In this work, we found a statistically significant change in the distributions of COS ratings after the training. Data analysis confirmed after the training more children had ratings who stayed the same between entry and exit and fewer children who made notably large rating increases (3 points or more). Again, these findings are consistent with data that are more accurate after the COS training event and also would result in lower values on Summary Satement 1. These data also help explain the slippage in Outcome C1 for all infants and toddlers excluding those in the “At-Risk” eligibility category. The FFY19 data analysis also supports the assertion that change in statewide performance data was in large part a result of the training. A final piece of evidence provided by ECTA and DaSy, State Child Outcomes Data Profile New Hampshire Part C 2018, shows that NH statewide performance has moved from being more than a standard deviation above the national average in C1 to closer to the national average after NH’s statewide COS training which is indicative of increased data quality. Therefore, while the state acknowledges that the data presented do not meet initial targets and did show slippage, these data are actually a better reflection of the functioning and progress of children who have been served in NH all along. NH’s outcomes data collection system is becoming stronger and the observed decreases result from those changes rather than from lower quality services being provided to children and families.

**Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable**

Indicator 3, Outcome C, Summary Statement 2 (C2) data were reported, first, for infants and toddlers with IFSPs exiting the New Hampshire (NH) Part C FCESS program, not including 23 of those in the “At-Risk” eligibility category. Based on the total of 1,304 infants and toddlers with IFSPs, the percentage of those (excluding “At-Risk”) who were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program was 56.98% for C2 measuring use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. NH did not meet the set target of 72.50% for C2. These results were below target by 15.52%. The FFY18 to FFY19 slippage for C2 (excluding “At-Risk”) was 3.24%. While Summary Statement 2 was quite a bit below New Hampshire’s self-identified target, the percentage found in NH’s at risk subset was very close to the national percentage of 57% found in FFY 2018 Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center & Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (2020) IDEA Child Outcomes Highlights for FFY2018. Retrieved from http://ectacenter.org/eco/pages/childoutcomeshighlights.asp.   
  
All 15 New Hampshire (NH) Family Centered Early Supports and Services (FCESS) local program staff engaged in a statewide Child Outcome Summary (COS) training between September 2017 and May 2018. Data reported in this FFY19 SSP/APR reflects NH’s third year post training and second year post statewide implementation The training reinforced the COS rating criteria and addressed a number of common misconceptions that had previously led to inaccuracies in ratings following several predictable patterns.The baseline and targets for Indicator 3 Outcome C Summary Statement 2 were set based on data prior to this statewide professional development event. Following a statewide system event of the COS training, slippage from these original targets continues to be observed. This slippage has been expected; data slippage is consistent with changes in practice that would occur when practitioners better understand and more accurately apply COS rating criteria. Current performance of outcomes data are consistent with those expected from more accurate data. We understand through Implementation Science and Theory of Change that, following a system wide change event, data typically reflects a decrease in outcomes. Recovery can take 2-3 years post implementation before a demonstration of effective change is evident.  
  
New ampshir (NH) engaged in monthly data analysis with national technical assistance (TA) that included the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy Center) and a Principal Education Researcher Center for Learning and Development / SRI Education. The data analysis provided evidence that NH’s COS data showed predictable changes before and after the COS training was implemented. Findings from these analyses were consistent with the assertion that data reported in FFY19 are more accurate after the statewide COS training and that training was a major factor in the data changes and slippage that occurred. Through data analysis including all children served in NH, we examined the distribution of entry ratings for Outcome C before and after the statewide COS training; these analyses showed an increase in children receiving ratings of a four or five at entry after the training. Outcome C also showed a decrease of 3% in the percentage of children rated as a 6 or a 7 at entry in FFY 18 and again in FFY 19. Ratings of four or five are indicative of children demonstrating some skills at age expectation, but also a mix of skills that are not age expected. Lower ratings of 6 and 7 are indicative of somewhat fewer children functioning fully at age expectatation on Outcome C at entry. The percentages of children entering at these levels were consistent with what we would expect given the children NH serves. They are also consistent with a stronger understanding of Outcome C. The data follow a pattern that suggests practitioners are basing ratings on the full breadth of content for using appropriate behaviors to meet needs rather than simply focusing on motor skills to meet needs. We also examined patterns in entry ratings and progress categories before and after the training. In this work, we found a statistically significant change in the distributions of COS ratings after the training. Data analysis confirmed after the training more children had ratings who stayed the same between entry and exit and fewer children who made notably large rating increases (3 points or more). Again, these findings are consistent with data that are more accurate after the COS training event and also would result in lower values on Summary Satement 2. These data also help explain the slippage in Outcome C2 for all infants and toddlers excluding those in the “At-Risk” eligibility category. The FFY19 data analysis also supports the assertion that change in statewide performance data was in large part a result of the training. A final piece of evidence provided by ECTA and DaSy, State Child Outcomes Data Profile New Hampshire Part C 2018, shows that NH statewide performance has moved from being more than a standard deviation above the national average in C2 to closer to the national average after NH’s statewide COS training which is indicative of increased data quality. Therefore, while the state acknowledges that the data presented do not meet initial targets and did show slippage, these data are actually a better reflection of the functioning and progress of children who have been served in NH all along. NH’s outcomes data collection system is becoming stronger and the observed decreases result from those changes rather than from lower quality services being provided to children and families.

| **Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 811 | 1,149 | 77.11% | 86.38% | 70.58% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| 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 | 752 | 1,327 | 60.32% | 72.50% | 56.67% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for C1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable**

Indicator 3, Outcome C, Summary Statement 1 (C1) data were reported, secondly, for all infants and toddlers with IFSPs exiting the New Hampshire (NH) Part C FCESS program, including 23 of those in the “At-Risk” eligibility category. Based on the total of 1,327 infants and toddlers with IFSPs, the percentage of those who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program was 70.58% for C1 measuring use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. NH did not meet the set target of 86.38% fo C1. These results were below target by 15.80%. The FFY18 to FFY19 slippage for C1 (including “At-Risk”) was 6.53%. While Summary Statement 1 was quite a bit below NH’s target, the percentage found in NH’s at risk subset was reasonably close to the national percentage of 76% found in FFY 2018 Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center & Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (2020) IDEA Child Outcomes Highlights for FFY2018. Retrieved from http://ectacenter.org/eco/pages/childoutcomeshighlights.asp.   
  
All 15 New Hampshire (NH) Family Centered Early Supports and Services (FCESS) local program staff engaged in a statewide Child Outcome Summary (COS) training between September 2017 and May 2018. Data reported in this FFY19 SSP/APR reflects NH’s third year post training and second year post statewide implementation The training reinforced the COS rating criteria and addressed a number of common misconceptions that had previously led to inaccuracies in ratings following several predictable patterns.The baseline and targets for Indicator 3 Outcome C Summary Statement 1 were set based on data prior to this statewide professional development event. Following a statewide system event of the COS training, slippage from these original targets continues to be observed. This slippage has been expected; data slippage is consistent with changes in practice that would occur when practitioners better understand and more accurately apply COS rating criteria. Current performance of outcomes data are consistent with those expected from more accurate data. We understand through Implementation Science and Theory of Change that, following a system wide change event, data typically reflects a decrease in outcomes. Recovery can take 2-3 years post implementation before a demonstration of effective change is evident.  
  
New Hampshire (NH) engaged in monthly data analysis with national technical assistance (TA) that included the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy Center) and a Principal Education Researcher Center for Learning and Development / SRI Education. The data analysis provided evidence that NH’s COS data showed predictable changes before and after the COS training was implemented. Findings from these analyses were consistent with the assertion that data reported in FFY19 are more accurate after the statewide COS training and that training was a major factor in the data changes and slippage that occurred. Through data analysis including all children served in NH, we examined the distribution of entry ratings for Outcome C before and after the statewide COS training; these analyses showed an increase in children receiving ratings of a four or five at entry after the training. Outcome C also showed a decrease of 3% in the percentage of children rated as a 6 or a 7 at entry in FFY 18 and again in FFY 19. Ratings of four or five are indicative of children demonstrating some skills at age expectation, but also a mix of skills that are not age expected. Lower ratings of 6 and 7 are indicative of somewhat fewer children functioning fully at age expectatation on Outcome C at entry. The percentages of children entering at these levels were consistent with what we would expect given the children NH serves. They are also consistent with a stronger understanding of Outcome C. The data follow a pattern that suggests practitioners are basing ratings on the full breadth of content for using appropriate behaviors to meet needs rather than simply focusing on motor skills to meet needs. We also examined patterns in entry ratings and progress categories before and after the training. In this work, we found a statistically significant change in the distributions of COS ratings after the training. Data analysis confirmed after the training more children had ratings who stayed the same between entry and exit and fewer children who made notably large rating increases (3 points or more). Again, these findings are consistent with data that are more accurate after the COS training event and also would result in lower values on Summary Satement 1. These data also help explain the slippage in Outcome C1 for all infants and toddlers including those in the “At-Risk” eligibility category. The FFY19 data analysis also supports the assertion that change in statewide performance data was in large part a result of the training. A final piece of evidence provided by ECTA and DaSy, State Child Outcomes Data Profile New Hampshire Part C 2018, shows that NH statewide performance has moved from being more than a standard deviation above the national average in C1 to closer to the national average after NH’s statewide COS training which is indicative of increased data quality. Therefore, while the state acknowledges that the data presented do not meet initial targets and did show slippage, these data are actually a better reflection of the functioning and progress of children who have been served in NH all along. NH’s outcomes data collection system is becoming stronger and the observed decreases result from those changes rather than from lower quality services being provided to children and families.

**Provide reasons for C2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable**

Indicator 3, Outcome C, Summary Statement 2 (C2) data were reported, secondly, for all infants and toddlers with IFSPs exiting the New Hampshire (NH) Part C FCESS program, including 23 of those in the “At-Risk” eligibility category. Based on the total of 1,327 infants and toddlers with IFSPs (including those “At-Risk”), the percentage of those who were functioning within age expectations in C2 by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program was 56.67% measuring use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. NH did not meet the set target of 72.50% for C2. These results were below target by 15.83%. The FFY18 to FFY19 slippage for C2 (including “At-Risk”) was 3.65%. While Summary Statement 2 was quite a bit below NH’s target, the percentage found in NH’s at risk subset was very close to the national percentage of 57% found in FFY 2018 Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center & Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (2020) IDEA Child Outcomes Highlights for FFY2018. Retrieved from http://ectacenter.org/eco/pages/childoutcomeshighlights.asp.   
  
All 15 New Hampshire (NH) Family Centered Early Supports and Services (FCESS) local program staff engaged in a statewide Child Outcome Summary (COS) training between September 2017 and May 2018. Data reported in this FFY19 SSP/APR reflects NH’s third year post training and second year post statewide implementation The training reinforced the COS rating criteria and addressed a number of common misconceptions that had previously led to inaccuracies in ratings following several predictable patterns.The baseline and targets for Indicator 3 Outcome C Summary Statement 2 were set based on data prior to this statewide professional development event. Following a statewide system event of the COS training, slippage from these original targets continues to be observed. This slippage has been expected; data slippage is consistent with changes in practice that would occur when practitioners better understand and more accurately apply COS rating criteria. Current performance of outcomes data are consistent with those expected from more accurate data. We understand through Implementation Science and Theory of Change that, following a system wide change event, data typically reflects a decrease in outcomes. Recovery can take 2-3 years post implementation before a demonstration of effective change is evident.  
  
New Hampshire (NH) engaged in monthly data analysis with national technical assistance (TA) that included the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy Center) and a Principal Education Researcher Center for Learning and Development / SRI Education. The data analysis provided evidence that NH’s COS data showed predictable changes before and after the COS training was implemented. Findings from these analyses were consistent with the assertion that data reported in FFY19 are more accurate after the statewide COS training and that training was a major factor in the data changes and slippage that occurred. Through data analysis including all children served in NH, we examined the distribution of entry ratings for Outcome C before and after the statewide COS training; these analyses showed an increase in children receiving ratings of a four or five at entry after the training. Outcome C also showed a decrease of 3% in the percentage of children rated as a 6 or a 7 at entry in FFY 18 and again in FFY 19. Ratings of four or five are indicative of children demonstrating some skills at age expectation, but also a mix of skills that are not age expected. Lower ratings of 6 and 7 are indicative of somewhat fewer children functioning fully at age expectatation on Outcome C at entry. The percentages of children entering at these levels were consistent with what we would expect given the children NH serves. They are also consistent with a stronger understanding of Outcome C. The data follow a pattern that suggests practitioners are basing ratings on the full breadth of content for using appropriate behaviors to meet needs rather than simply focusing on motor skills to meet needs. We also examined patterns in entry ratings and progress categories before and after the training. In this work, we found a statistically significante change in the distributions of COS ratings after the training. Data analysis confirmed after the training more children had ratings who stayed the same between entry and exit and fewer children who made notably large rating increases (3 points or more). Again, these findings are consistent with data that are more accurate after the COS training event and also would result in lower values on Summary Satement 2. These data also help explain the slippage in Outcome C2 for all infants and toddlers including those in the “At-Risk” eligibility category. The FFY19 data analysis also supports the assertion that change in statewide performance data was in large part a result of the training. A final piece of evidence provided by ECTA and DaSy, State Child Outcomes Data Profile New Hampshire Part C 2018, shows that NH statewide performance has moved from being more than a standard deviation above the national average in C2 to closer to the national average after NH’s statewide COS training which is indicative of increased data quality. Therefore, while the state acknowledges that the data presented do not meet initial targets and did show slippage, these data are actually a better reflection of the functioning and progress of children who have been served in NH all along. NH’s outcomes data collection system is becoming stronger and the observed decreases result from those changes rather than from lower quality services being provided to children and families.

**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 | 2,054 |
| 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. | 535 |

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

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

YES

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

New Hampshire (NH) Part C uses the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Process (COS) which defines “comparable to same-aged peers” as a child who has been assigned a rating of 6-7 on the COS 7-point rating scale. A rating of 6-7 indicates that a child’s functioning meets age expectations.  
  
New Hampshire (NH) Part C uses the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Process (COS) process which is a team approach for summarizing information on a child’s functioning in each of the three child outcome areas using a 7-point scale. A team can consider multiple sources of information about a child, including results from assessment, parent input, Larimer Country Age-Anchoring, and observations. Additionally, the COS process allows programs to synthesize information about children across different assessment tools to produce data that can be summarized across programs in the state. Local programs enter individual child COS entry ratings into the state NH Leads data system for infants and toddlers who are at least 6 months of age and enter exit ratings for those who have been receiving Part C FCESS for at least 6 months. The COS data report is run by the data manager for the current SSP/APR reporting year using the COS data calculator.

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

Indicator 3, Outcomes A, B and C data were reported, first, for infants and toddlers with IFSPs exiting the NH Part C FCESS program, not including those in the “At-Risk” eligibility category. This group included 1,304 infants and toddlers. NH data was reported, secondly, for all infants and toddlers with IFSPs exiting the NH Part C FCESS program, including those in the “At-Risk” eligibility category. This group included 1,327 infants and toddlers.  
  
Indicator 3, Outcome A measuring positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) included: Summary Statement 1 (A1) measuring the percentage of those who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program and Summary Statement 2 (A2) measuring the percentage of those who were functioning within age expectations by the time they exited the program. Local program data for A1 showed seven of 15 programs performed below the statewide data in both groups of,1,304 infants and toddlers (excluding At Risk category) 65.61% and 1,327 infants and toddlers (including At Risk category) 65.33%. Local program data for A2 showed nine of 15 programs performed below the statewide data in both groups of,1,304 infants and toddlers (excluding At Risk category) 63.80% and 1,327 infants and toddlers (including At Risk category) 65.53%.  
  
Indicator 3, Outcome B measuring acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) included: Summary Statement 1 measuring the percentage who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program (B1) and Summary Statement 2 (B2) measuring the percentage of those who were functioning within age expectations by the time they exited the program. Local program data for B1 showed eight of 15 programs performed below the statewide data in both groups of,1,304 infants and toddlers (excluding At Risk category) 66.88% and 1,327 infants and toddlers (including At Risk category) 66.55%. Based on 1,304 infants and toddlers (excluding At Risk category), local program data for B2 showed eight of 15 programs performed below the statewide data of 53.76%. Based on the1,327 infants and toddlers (including At Risk category), nine of 15 local programs performed below the statwide data 53.65% for B2.   
  
Indicator 3, Outcome C measuring use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs included: Summary Statement 1 measuring the percentage of those who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program (C1) and Summary Statement 2 measuring the percentage of those who were functioning within age expectations by the time they exited the program (C2). Local program data for C1 showed seven of 15 programs performed below the statewide data of 70.95% in the group of 1,304 infants and toddlers (excluding At Risk category). Four local programs performed below the statewide data of 70.58% in the group of 1,327 infants and toddlers (including At Risk category) for C1.Based on the 1,304 infants and toddlers (excluding At Risk category), eight local programs performed below the statewide data of 56.98% for C2. Based on the1,327 infants and toddlers (including At Risk category), nine of 15 local programs performed below the statwide data 56.67% for C2.

## 3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3 - OSEP Response

## 3 - Required Actions

## 3 - State Attachments



# Indicator 4: Family Involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

**Results indicator:** Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

A. Know their rights;

B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and

C. Help their children develop and learn.

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source. State must describe the data source in the SPP/APR.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children’s needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling of families participating in Part C is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of families to whom the surveys were distributed.

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

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the families responding are not representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to families (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person), if a survey was used, and how responses were collected.

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

## 4 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2010 | Target>= | 87.00% | 87.00% | 87.50% | 87.50% | 88.00% |
| A | 86.00% | Data | 85.71% | 83.05% | 86.94% | 88.83% | 90.63% |
| B | 2010 | Target>= | 91.10% | 91.20% | 91.50% | 91.70% | 92.00% |
| B | 87.00% | Data | 92.86% | 89.49% | 91.42% | 93.87% | 92.50% |
| C | 2010 | Target>= | 87.10% | 87.20% | 87.50% | 87.70% | 88.00% |
| C | 85.00% | Data | 87.30% | 85.59% | 87.87% | 90.27% | 91.72% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A>= | 88.00% |
| Target B>= | 92.00% |
| Target C>= | 88.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Part C State Office intentionally engages stakeholder groups. Groups are created and those chosen who are interested in or affected by significant decisions regarding the Part C System are invited to participate. Stakeholders in NH include (a) families, (b) providers, (c) Area Agencies (AAs), (d) other early childhood programs, (e) advocates, and (f) other programs serving children and their families, including but not limited to programs in areas of education, family support, and health.   
  
The Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) membership reflects federal membership requirements. Although there are some vacancies in the appointed membership that the ICC is working to fill, it is well attended by the current members. The ICC has had difficulty recruiting family members. Families are supported to participate on the ICC by reimbursement for mileage and child care to participate in meetings, work groups, and other ICC activities. Families are also supported for their participations in "Welcome to ESS" (WESS) orientation, and other times when stakeholder input may be collected. Distance participation is available through the use of technology, video conferencing, email, public hearing, and phone calls. NH is currently working on ICC family recruitment and documents to explain the importance and purpose of the ICC.  
  
Stakeholder input is gathered through stakeholder activities such as (a) group email discussions, (b) face to face meetings, (c) conference calls, and (d) web workshops to enhance decision making for the statewide system. The primary stakeholder meetings are the Quarterly FCESS Meetings and the ICC meetings which typically convene every other month. However, due to the COVID-19 Pandemic during FFY19, ICC meetings were rescheduled and moved to all virtual. Part C FCESS state and local staff participate in public awareness activities, organizations, councils, and committees as stakeholders to give and gather input throughout the year. Annual Family Outcome Surveys help the Part C system to gather family input. Strong partnership with New Hampshire Family Voices (NHFV) and Parent Information Center (PIC) enable the state staff to gather family input through their networks.   
  
The Part C State Office staff held stakeholder meetings with ICC on December 4, 2020 and FCESS Quarterly on December 9, 2020. These meetings included review of Indicator 3 data analysis and discussions of setting FFY20 targets. Both stakeholder groups agreed the decrease and slippage in outcome data for Indicator 3 was impacted by the statewide training. Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic and limited capacity during FFY19, both stakeholder groups also agreed to maintain FFY19 targets and develop new baseline and targets for FFY20 reporting. NH Part C State Office will be engaging stakeholders throughout the upcoming year in data analysis meetings for setting baselines and projecting yearly targets for all indicators in the upcoming SSP/APR FFY20 – 25 package.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The number of families to whom surveys were distributed | 1,086 |
| Number of respondent families participating in Part C | 531 |
| A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 452 |
| A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 531 |
| 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 | 484 |
| B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | 531 |
| 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 | 465 |
| C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn | 531 |

| **Measure** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2) | 90.63% | 88.00% | 85.12% | Did Not Meet Target | 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) | 92.50% | 92.00% | 91.15% | Did Not Meet Target | 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) | 91.72% | 88.00% | 87.57% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for part A slippage, if applicable**

New Hampshire’s (NH) FFY19 Family Outcome Survey (FOS) data 85.12% did not meet its 88% target for percentage of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (4A). NH’s FFY19 data indicated a 5.51% slippage in comparison to FFY18 data for Indicator 4A. State data analysis identified slippage in 11 of 15 local programs’ data. This included four programs with less than 5% decrease, three programs between 7% and 9% decrease, and four programs between 12% and 15% decrease. The increase in local program slippage impacted the state data and slippage for Indicator 4A. Due to the distribution of the FOS during the initial months of the COVID-19 Pandemic, a variety of variables may have impacted families responses to the survey (i.e. increased stressors, home schooling, changes to family schedules, and adjusting to virtual services) which may have also impacted data slippage.

**Provide reasons for part B slippage, if applicable**

New Hampshire’s (NH) FFY19 Family Outcome Survey (FOS) data 91.15% did not meet its 92% target for percentage of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (4B). NH’s FFY19 data indicated a 1.35% slippage in comparison to FFY18 data for Indicator 4B. State data analysis identified slippage in 10 of 15 local programs’ data. This included six programs with less than 5% decrease, two programs with 6.32% and 7.51% decrease, and two programs with 12.50% and 17% decrease. The increase in local program slippage impacted the state data and slippage for Indicator 4B. Due to the distribution of the FOS during the initial months of the COVID-19 Pandemic, a variety of variables may have impacted families responses to the survey (i.e. increased stressors, home schooling, changes to family schedules, and adjusting to virtual services) which may have also impacted data slippage.

**Provide reasons for part C slippage, if applicable**

New Hampshire’s (NH) FFY19 Family Outcome Survey (FOS) data 87.57% did not meet its 88% target for percentage of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (4C). NH’s FFY19 data indicated a 4.15% slippage in comparison to FFY18 data for Indicator 4C. State data analysis identified slippage in 11 of 15 local programs’ data. This included six programs with less than 5% decrease, two programs with 6.25% and 7.83% decrease, and three programs with 10.57%, 13.52%, and 25.69% decrease. The increase in local program slippage impacted the state data and slippage for Indicator 4C. Due to the distribution of the FOS during the initial months of the COVID-19 Pandemic, a variety of variables may have impacted families responses to the survey (i.e. increased stressors, home schooling, changes to family schedules, and adjusting to virtual services) which may have also impacted data 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 families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program. | NO |

**If not, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

The State Part C office will engage stakeholders in analysis this coming year to determine the reason for non-representative family responses in the race and ethnicity demographics. Gender demographics for FFY19 is representative of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in NH Part C FCESS program.

**Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.**

FFY19 Family Outcome Surveys (FOS) were distributed to all families with current active IFSPs, who participated in NH Part C Family Centered Early Supports and Services (FCESS) for at least 6 months as of April 1, 2020. The Part C State Office prepares the surveys for local programs in multiple languages. All programs are expected to participate in activities that will maintain a high response rate including but not limited to providing interpreters, hand delivering surveys, offering an online option, assistance with understanding the survey and its purpose, and assistance with mailing completed sealed surveys to the Part C State Office.   
  
Fifteen of 15 local FCESS programs participated in the FFY19 FOS process with respondents from all regions of the state. Local programs distributed 1,086 (51.59% of 618 12/1/19 Exit data) surveys. The statewide response rate generated a 51% (553) families served by FCESS for 6 months or more in this FFY19 reporting period. Survey demographics include child’s race, ethnicity, and gender. Data is analyzed at state and local program levels to ensure representativeness is obtained and represents the work of the Part C FCESS statewide system.   
  
The demographics of the FOS respondent group are checked for alignment with the demographics of the 618 Exiting Data group to further ensure representativeness of the FCESS statewide system. Race, ethnicity and gender are self-reported through the survey. Comparison of 618 data and the FOS responses showed that the percentage in five race and ethnicity categories including; American Indian or Alaskan Native (618 data 0.05%, FOS 0.0%), Asian (618 data 2.09%, FOS 1.81%), Black or African American (618 data 1.43%, FOS 1.27%), Hispanic/Latino (618 data 4.42%, FOS 2.35%), Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (618 data 0.10%, FOS 0.0%) had an overall 3.29% decrease in the FOS respondents than the 618 reported exit data. This FOS percentage decrease in comparison to the 618 percentage indicates a less than representative sample of families in these race and ethnicity categories receiving services through FCESS statewide. In the categories Two or more (618 data 5.84%, FOS 7.41%) and White (618 data 86.08%, FOS 87.16%) had an overall 2.65% increase in the FOS respondents than the 618 reported exiting data. This data indicates a representative of families in these race ethnicity categories receiving services through FCESS statewide.  
  
Data comparison of gender between 618 data exiting group and the FOS responses indicate a representative of families receiving services through FCESS statewide. Exiting 618 data included 35.72% females and 64.28% males. FOS data included 36.53% females and 64.21% males for FFY19.

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

Due to the distribution of the Family Outcome Survey (FOS) during the initial months of the COVID-19 Pandemic and the Stay at Home Emergency order issued in March 2020, a variety of variables may have impacted Indicator 4 data for FFY19 Reporting. For example; local programs had limited ability to distribute paper copies in families native language as in previous years, families were virtually provided a Survey Monkey link to access an English version, family stressors or circumstance during COVID-19 may have impacted families responses to the survey, families and local program staff were adjusting to virtual services, and families had limited access to local staff for clarifying questions while completing the online survey.

## 4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4 - OSEP Response

## 4 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2020 response data are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program , and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the population.

## 4 - State Attachments



# Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)) and Census (for the denominator).

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State’s reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 1.38% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 1.50% | 1.60% | 1.70% | 1.80% | 1.90% |
| Data | 2.10% | 2.47% | 2.28% | 2.43% | 2.38% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 1.90% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Part C State Office intentionally engages stakeholder groups. Groups are created and those chosen who are interested in or affected by significant decisions regarding the Part C System are invited to participate. Stakeholders in NH include (a) families, (b) providers, (c) Area Agencies (AAs), (d) other early childhood programs, (e) advocates, and (f) other programs serving children and their families, including but not limited to programs in areas of education, family support, and health.   
  
The Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) membership reflects federal membership requirements. Although there are some vacancies in the appointed membership that the ICC is working to fill, it is well attended by the current members. The ICC has had difficulty recruiting family members. Families are supported to participate on the ICC by reimbursement for mileage and child care to participate in meetings, work groups, and other ICC activities. Families are also supported for their participations in "Welcome to ESS" (WESS) orientation, and other times when stakeholder input may be collected. Distance participation is available through the use of technology, video conferencing, email, public hearing, and phone calls. NH is currently working on ICC family recruitment and documents to explain the importance and purpose of the ICC.  
  
Stakeholder input is gathered through stakeholder activities such as (a) group email discussions, (b) face to face meetings, (c) conference calls, and (d) web workshops to enhance decision making for the statewide system. The primary stakeholder meetings are the Quarterly FCESS Meetings and the ICC meetings which typically convene every other month. However, due to the COVID-19 Pandemic during FFY19, ICC meetings were rescheduled and moved to all virtual. Part C FCESS state and local staff participate in public awareness activities, organizations, councils, and committees as stakeholders to give and gather input throughout the year. Annual Family Outcome Surveys help the Part C system to gather family input. Strong partnership with New Hampshire Family Voices (NHFV) and Parent Information Center (PIC) enable the state staff to gather family input through their networks.   
  
The Part C State Office staff held stakeholder meetings with ICC on December 4, 2020 and FCESS Quarterly on December 9, 2020. These meetings included review of Indicator 3 data analysis and discussions of setting FFY20 targets. Both stakeholder groups agreed the decrease and slippage in outcome data for Indicator 3 was impacted by the statewide training. Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic and limited capacity during FFY19, both stakeholder groups also agreed to maintain FFY19 targets and develop new baseline and targets for FFY20 reporting. NH Part C State Office will be engaging stakeholders throughout the upcoming year in data analysis meetings for setting baselines and projecting yearly targets for all indicators in the upcoming SSP/APR FFY20 – 25 package.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/08/2020 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs | 961 |
| Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin | 06/25/2020 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 | 12,052 |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs** | **Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 961 | 12,052 | 2.38% | 1.90% | 7.97% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Compare your results to the national data**

The IDEA Part C national average for this indicator FFY19 reporting is 1.37%. NH consistently performs above the national average for birth to one child find. In the 2019 Child Count Data Charts prepared by IDEA Infant and Toddler Coordinators Association (ITCA) January 2021, NH ranks in the top 50% (1st of 18, 6.60% above average) of states in ‘Category B Eligibility’ (from ITCA - Category B: 25% in two or more domains, 30% delay in one or more domains, 1.3 standard deviations in two domains, 1.5 standard deviations in any domain, 33% delay in one domain) who meet/exceed the national average. NH also ranks in the top 39% (1st of 21, 6.60% above average) of the states in ‘Health Lead Agencies’ category (children receiving services under a health lead agency) who meet/exceed the national average.

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

New Hampshire (NH) serves children under the following categories established conditions, a 33% developmental delay in any one area of development, atypical behavior, or who are at risk for substantial delay. The greatest numbers of children eligible for services are those in the developmental delay category. Children at risk for substantial delay are eligible for services if there are 5 or more child or family risk factors or a combination of both child and family risk factors. NH continues to monitor outreach efforts to the at risk population, particularly those affected by substance use or those who are homeless, to ensure we are reaching eligible children in vulnerable populations. Early childhood partners and family organizations work continuously to improve the early identification of children with the need for Part C services. Improved screening and strong partnerships are considered the root cause of increases in the number of children found eligible for Part C services in NH.   
  
Data used to determine the number of children served is taken from the NH Leads statewide data system. This data is verified by regional area agencies and local programs to ensure accuracy. The verified data is used for Federal reporting on December 1 - child count data reports under section 618 of the IDEA. The December 1 child count data for this report is the number of children, age birth to one, with an active IFSP on 12/1/2019. Active IFSPs are considered to be any IFSP with parental consent. Information used in the IDEA Part C National Table are considered ‘point in time’ data and reflect the number of children with active IFSPs as of 12/1 of any given year. National data Sources: U.S. Department of Education, EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS): “IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey,” 2019. Data extracted as of July 8, 2020. U.S. Bureau of the Census. "2019 State Population Estimates by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin". Data accessed July 2020 from http://www.census.gov/popest   
  
The NH Part C FCESS system consistently surpasses state targets for Indicator 5. The target for child find, birth to one, for FFY19 was 1.90% of the total population for this age group. The state Part C FCESS system achieved a rate of 7.97% of the state birth to one population being served. NH not only surpassed it’s FFY19 target, the data also shows a 5.66% increase over FFY18 data.  
  
COVID-19 Pandemic did not impact NH’s Indicator 5 data for this reporting year since the December 1 child count for reporting FFY19 data was prior to the Pandemic and the State of Emergency Stay At Home order.

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Data Source**

Data collected under IDEA section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)) and Census (for the denominator).

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State’s reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

## 6 - Indicator Data

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 2.96% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 3.50% | 3.60% | 3.70% | 3.80% | 3.90% |
| Data | 5.15% | 5.21% | 5.19% | 5.35% | 5.70% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 3.90% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Part C State Office intentionally engages stakeholder groups. Groups are created and those chosen who are interested in or affected by significant decisions regarding the Part C System are invited to participate. Stakeholders in NH include (a) families, (b) providers, (c) Area Agencies (AAs), (d) other early childhood programs, (e) advocates, and (f) other programs serving children and their families, including but not limited to programs in areas of education, family support, and health.   
  
The Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) membership reflects federal membership requirements. Although there are some vacancies in the appointed membership that the ICC is working to fill, it is well attended by the current members. The ICC has had difficulty recruiting family members. Families are supported to participate on the ICC by reimbursement for mileage and child care to participate in meetings, work groups, and other ICC activities. Families are also supported for their participations in "Welcome to ESS" (WESS) orientation, and other times when stakeholder input may be collected. Distance participation is available through the use of technology, video conferencing, email, public hearing, and phone calls. NH is currently working on ICC family recruitment and documents to explain the importance and purpose of the ICC.  
  
Stakeholder input is gathered through stakeholder activities such as (a) group email discussions, (b) face to face meetings, (c) conference calls, and (d) web workshops to enhance decision making for the statewide system. The primary stakeholder meetings are the Quarterly FCESS Meetings and the ICC meetings which typically convene every other month. However, due to the COVID-19 Pandemic during FFY19, ICC meetings were rescheduled and moved to all virtual. Part C FCESS state and local staff participate in public awareness activities, organizations, councils, and committees as stakeholders to give and gather input throughout the year. Annual Family Outcome Surveys help the Part C system to gather family input. Strong partnership with New Hampshire Family Voices (NHFV) and Parent Information Center (PIC) enable the state staff to gather family input through their networks.   
  
The Part C State Office staff held stakeholder meetings with ICC on December 4, 2020 and FCESS Quarterly on December 9, 2020. These meetings included review of Indicator 3 data analysis and discussions of setting FFY20 targets. Both stakeholder groups agreed the decrease and slippage in outcome data for Indicator 3 was impacted by the statewide training. Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic and limited capacity during FFY19, both stakeholder groups also agreed to maintain FFY19 targets and develop new baseline and targets for FFY20 reporting. NH Part C State Office will be engaging stakeholders throughout the upcoming year in data analysis meetings for setting baselines and projecting yearly targets for all indicators in the upcoming SSP/APR FFY20 – 25 package.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/08/2020 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs | 2,105 |
| Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin | 06/25/2020 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 | 37,205 |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs** | **Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2,105 | 37,205 | 5.70% | 3.90% | 5.66% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Compare your results to the national data**

The IDEA Part C national average for this indicator FFY19 reporting is 3.70%. NH consistently performs above the national average for birth to three child find. In the 2019 Child Count Data Charts prepared by IDEA Infant and Toddler Coordinators Association (ITCA) January 2021, NH ranks in the top 56% (5th of 18, 1.96% above average) of states in ‘Category B Eligibility’ (from ITCA - Category B: 25% in two or more domains, 30% delay in one or more domains, 1.3 standard deviations in two domains, 1.5 standard deviations in any domain, 33% delay in one domain) who meet/exceed the national average. NH also ranks in the top 38% (5th of 21, 1.96% above average) of the states in ‘Health Lead Agencies’ category (children receiving services under a health lead agency) who meet/exceed the national average.

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

New Hampshire (NH) serves children in the following categories established conditions, 33% developmental delay in any one area of development, atypical behavior, and at risk for substantial delay. The greatest numbers of children eligible for services are those in the developmental delay category. Children at risk for substantial delay are eligible for services if there are five child or family risk factors. NH continues to monitor outreach efforts to the at risk population, particularly those affected by substance use or those who are homeless, to ensure we are reaching eligible children in this vulnerable population. In NH FCESS, early childhood partners and family organizations work continuously to improve the early identification of children with the need for Part C services. Improved screening and strong partnerships are considered the root cause of increases in the number of children found eligible for Part C services.  
  
Data used to determine the number of children served is taken from the statewide data system. This data is verified by Part C State Office, regional area agencies, and local programs to ensure accuracy. The verified data is used for Federal reporting on December 1 - child count data reports under section 618 of the IDEA. The December 1 child count data for this report is the number of children, age birth through two years, with active IFSPs on 12/1/2019. Active IFSPs are considered to be any IFSP with parental consent. Information used in the IDEA Part C National Table are considered ‘point in time’ data and reflect the number of children with active IFSPs as of 12/1 of any given year. National data Sources: U.S. Department of Education, EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS): “IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey,” 2019. Data extracted as of July 8, 2020. U.S. Bureau of the Census. "2019 State Population Estimates by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin". Data accessed July 2020 from http://www.census.gov/popest.   
  
NH Part FCESS system consistently surpasses state targets for Indicator 6. The target for child find, birth through age 2, for FFY19 was 3.90% of the total population for this age group. The state Part C FCESS system achieved a rate of 5.66% of the state birth through age 2 population being served (see attached Indicator 6 All Children Under 3 Child Find data tables). Although NH exceeded it’s FFY19 target, there is a slight decrease from FFY18 data by 0.04%.  
  
COVID-19 Pandemic did not impact NH’s Indicator 6 data for this reporting year since the December 1 child count for reporting FFY19 data was prior to the Pandemic and the State of Emergency Stay At Home order.

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

## 6 - Required Actions

# Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must address the timeline from point of referral to initial IFSP meeting based on actual, not an average, number of days.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.

**Instructions**

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child’s record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 99.40% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 99.07% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline** | **Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 187 | 221 | 99.07% | 100% | 98.19% | 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.**

30

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

State monitoring

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

All 15 New Hampshire (NH) Part C Family Centered Early Supports and Services (FCESS) local programs are monitored using the NH Leads state database system throughout the year. To verify that information in the data system is valid and reliable, a randomly selected sample from the Timely Service Monitoring report (including the months of July – November) was reviewed by the Part C State Office monitoring team for each local program. The Timely Service Monitoring report indicates the IFSP start date as the parent consent date. A random sample for each local program is defined as 5% of the total number of children with IFSPs served by the program during the previous fiscal year or a minimum of 10 records. If a discovery of noncompliance is identified in the initial data report, local programs have a 90-day pre-finding correction period to explain acceptable circumstances or demonstrate 100% compliance with Indicator 7. If 100% compliance is not demonstrated within the 90-day pre-finding correction period, a finding of noncompliance is issued. The program with a finding of noncompliance must then engage in a corrective action plan process that includes one year of quarterly monitoring. Technical assistance is provided to local programs by the Part C State Office staff to ensure successful correction of noncompliance.  
  
Compliance for Indicator 7 is defined as the number of calendar days from the date of referral to the date the family signs the IFSP indicating consent. Targets for Indicator 7 is 100% compliance for all local programs in NH. The state included in its calculation the number of children for whom the state identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record. NH state compliance for FFY19 of 98.19% did not meet the target of 100% for Indicator 7. This was determined through review of NH Leads data system and individual child record documentation.  
  
In the initial data report sample of 221 records for FFY19 reporting period, 187 were found to have received timely IFSP development with consent within Part C 45-day timeline from the date of referral. Thirty IFSPs were delayed due to documented exceptional family circumstances (EFC) verified within the individual child documentation. The Part C state monitoring team verified delayed circumstance through review of electronically submitted case notes and phone logs. Therefore 98.19% [(187+30)=217] of children received timely IFSP development with consent. IFSP consent was obtained as soon as families were available for the 30 children whose IFSPs were developed beyond the required Part C 45-day timeline due to EFC. Documentation of EFC included but was not limited to; families not responding to calls or letters to schedule, families canceling timely scheduled meetings and requesting to reschedule beyond the 45-day timeline date, and families initially requesting to schedule beyond 45-day timeline due to work and/or family schedules. Although delayed, all IFSPs were completed with parental consent at a time that was convenient and agreed upon with the family.  
  
Eleven of 15 local programs achieved 100% compliance in the initial sample data for reporting and review of individual child documentation. A discovery of noncompliance was identified in the initial data report and through review of four individual child records in the following local programs: Region 6 Gateways Community Services (GW) at 95% compliance, Region 6 The Children’s Pyramid (TCP6) at 90% compliance, Region 8 Richie McFarland Children’s Center (RMCC) at 92% compliance, and Region 10 Easterseals (ES10) at 94% compliance. Program reasons for these delayed IFSPs included; GW program did not have documentation of attempts to contact family and schedule a timely meeting, TCP6 program did not include a multidisciplinary team at the IFSP meeting, and both RMCC and ES10 programs received the initial referral information beyond the 45-day timeline from the Area Agencies accepting the referrals.   
  
The state reviewed two months of subsequent data and documentation for each program as follows. GW’s data included 45 records that showed 35 timely IFSPs, five delayed IFSPs due to documented EFC, and five delayed IFSPs due to documented COVID-19 Pandemic and the need to reschedule to virtual meetings. TCP6 data included 12 records that showed 11 timely IFSPs and one delayed IFSP due to documented EFC. RMCC data included 28 records that showed 27 timely IFSPs and one delayed IFSP due to documented EFC. ES10 data included 55 records that showed 52 timely IFSPs and three delayed IFSPs due to documented EFC. Based upon this subsequent review, a finding of noncompliance was not issued to any of the four programs because the programs were able to demonstrate 100% compliance for this indicator during the 90-day pre-finding correction period.

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

NH Part C State Office was unable to conduct onsite monitoring for FFY19 due to the COVID-19 Pandemic and the State of Emergency Stay At Home order issued on 3/13/20. The Part C State Office directed local programs to electronically submit documentation from the children's records for the random sample identified in the program’s Timely Service Monitoring report. The Part C State Office monitoring team reviewed and verified submitted documentation for compliance.  
  
COVID-19 Pandemic did not impact NH’s initial Indicator 7 data or performance this reporting year since the sample time period used for reporting FFY19 data was prior to when the pandemic and state emergency hit in March 2020. However, the COVID-19 Pandemic did impact the subsequent 90-day pre-finding data review which showed five IFSP meetings needed to be postponed and rescheduled to virtual meetings due to the State’s Emergency Stay At Home order in Mach 2020. The State determined these rescheduled IFSP meetings were not identified as a finding of non-compliance.  
  
Noncompliance reported in FFY18 State Performance Plan (SSP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) for Indicator 7, 45-day Timeline, included two IFPs were delayed for reasons within program control at one local program. The local program Waypoint (WP) in FFY18 SSP/APR data was reported as 80% compliance with two IFSPs completed beyond the 45-day Timeline. Although parent consent on the two IFSPs were obtained beyond the 45-day required timeline, both IFSPs were developed and consent was obtained at a time agreed upon with the families. The State identified these IFSPs as a discovery of noncompliance The local program provided staff training and achieving 100% compliance in the subsequent pre-finding data reports within the pre-finding 90-day period prior to the issuance of a finding of noncompliance.  
  
In order to verify the local program was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for Indicator 7, the state reviewed subsequent pre-finding data from NHLeads, the state’s Part C data system, during the 90-day pre-finding period for this program. WP’s subsequent data report included 10 records which showed all 10 IFSPs were developed and parental consent was obtained within the 45-day required timeline. To confirm accuracy of the NHLeads data used for verification, the local program WP was required to submit documentation from the records of these children showing timely IFSP development and consent.  
  
Based on review of the local program WP subsequent pre-finding data reports and individual child documentation, the Part C State Office determined the local program achieved compliance during the 90-day pre-finding correction period prior to the issuance of a finding and was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for Indicator 7. Therefore, no findings of noncompliance were issued to the local WP program for Indicator 7 in FFY18 due to pre-finding data showing the program is correctly implementing regulatory requirements  
  
For the local program with a discovery of non-compliance on Indicator 7, the state Part C staff used NHLeads, the state’s Part C data system, and individual child documentation to verify that for each instance of noncompliance involved in the FFY18 APR that the child did have an initial evaluation, assessment and IFSP meeting, though late. The state Part C Office has verified that the local program with noncompliance identified in FFY18 and reported by New Hampshire under this indicator in the FFY18 APR has held an initial evaluation, assessment and IFSP meeting for each child identified during discovery, although late, and is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

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

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

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

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

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

## 7 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.   
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

## 7 - State Attachments



# Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator:** The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday;

B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and

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

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

**Instructions**

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child’s record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to “opt-out” of the referral. Under the State’s opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State’s Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 98.80% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 99.19% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 99.06% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday. (yes/no)**

YES

| **Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 102 | 102 | 99.06% | 100% | 100.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances**   
**This number will be added to the “Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services” field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.**

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

State monitoring

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

All 15 New Hampshire (NH) Part C FCESS local programs are monitored using the NH Leads state database system throughout the year. To verify that information in the data system is valid and reliable for this FFY19 reporting, a randomly selected sample from the Transition Monitoring report (including the months of July – November) was reviewed by the Part C State Office monitoring team for each local program. The Transition Monitoring report indicates the date a transition plan is initiated. A random sample for each local program is defined as 10% of the total number of children that transitioned to Part B during the previous fiscal year or a minimum of six records. If a discovery of noncompliance is identified in the initial data report, local programs have a 90-day pre-finding correction period to explain acceptable circumstances or demonstrate 100% compliance with Indicator 8a. If 100% compliance is not demonstrated within the 90-day pre-finding correction period, a finding of noncompliance is issued. The program with a finding of noncompliance must then engage in a corrective action plan process that includes one year of quarterly monitoring. Technical assistance is provided to local programs by the Part C State Office staff to ensure successful correction of noncompliance.  
  
Compliance with Indicator 8a is defined as developing a transition plan including steps and services of transition completed at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday. Target for Indicator 8a is 100% compliance for all local FCESS programs in NH. In the initial data report sample, 102 records were reviewed for FFY19 reporting and all 102 IFSPs contained a transition plan developed at least 90 days or more and less than 9 months prior to the child’s third birthday. Therefore, NH met the 100% (102/102) compliance target for Indicator 8a through review of the transition monitoring data report and verification of submitted documentation.

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

NH Part C State Office was unable to conduct onsite monitoring for FFY19 due to the COVID-19 Pandemic and the State of Emergency Stay At Home order issued on 3/13/20. The Part C State Office directed local programs to electronically submit documentation from the children’s records for the random sample identified in the program’s Transition Monitoring report. The Part C State Office monitoring team reviewed this documentation to verify compliance. COVID-19 Pandemic did not impact NH’s Indicator 8a data or performance this reporting year since the sample time period used for reporting FFY19 data was prior to when the pandemic and state emergency hit in March 2020.  
  
Noncompliance reported in FFY18 State Performance Plan (SSP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) for Indicator 8a, Transition Plan, included one transition plan missing a second provider signature to meet the requirement of multidisciplinary team signatures. The local program Rise for baby and family (Rise) data was reported as 83% compliance with one noncompliant transition plan. Although this transition plan was developed timely, between 27 and 32 months, the State identified the missing multidisciplinary team signatures as a discovery of noncompliance. The local program provided staff training and achieving 100% compliance in the subsequent pre-finding data report and individual child documentation within the pre-finding 90-day period prior to the issuance of a finding of noncompliance.  
  
In order to verify that the local program was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for Indicator 8a, the state reviewed subsequent pre-finding data from NHLeads, the state’s Part C data system, during the 90-day pre-finding correction period for this local program. The subsequent data report included 11 transition records indicating all 11 transition plans were developed between 27 and 32 months. To confirm accuracy of the NHLeads data used for verification, the local program was required to submit documentation from the records of these children showing timely development of transition plans and multidisciplinary team signatures.  
  
Based on review of the the local program’s subsequent pre-finding data reports and individual child documentation, the Part C State Office determined the program achieved compliance during the 90-day pre-finding correction period prior to the issuance of a finding and was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for Indicator 8a. Therefore, no findings of noncompliance were issued to the local program for Indicator 8a in FFY18 due to pre-finding data showing local program correctly implementing regulatory requirements.  
  
For the local Rise program with a discovery of non-compliance on Indicator 8a, the state Part C staff used NHLeads, the state’s Part C data system, and individual child documentation to verify that for each instance of noncompliance involved in the FFY18 APR that the child did receive a timely transition plan, although missing multidisciplinary team signatures. The state Part C Office has verified that the local program with noncompliance identified in FFY18 and reported by New Hampshire under this indicator in the FFY18 APR has is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

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

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

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

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

## 8A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8A - OSEP Response

## 8A - Required Actions

## 8A - State Attachments



# Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator:** The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday;

B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and

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

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

**Instructions**

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child’s record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to “opt-out” of the referral. Under the State’s opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State’s Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8B - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 99.60% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 97.17% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 98.11% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

| **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 96 | 102 | 98.11% | 100% | 96.97% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

New Hampshire (NH) state data system indicated that all 102 notifications to the LEA were in compliance. Slippage for Indicator 3b is due to three of the 102 notifications to the SEA in FFY19 reporting period were entered into the NH data system beyond the required 90 days prior to a child’s third birthday due to program control. This was an increase of one late notification from FFY18. These late SEA data entries included three staff within two local programs not following program procedures for LEA/SEA notifications. The State determined local staff training was needed to ensure data entry for SEA notification is timely.

**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.**

3

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

New Hampshire’s state database system known as NH Leads indicates if a family has chosen to opt out of the SEA and LEA notification transition process within the Transition Monitoring data report. The data system also indicates if the family changes their mind and requests a notification to the LEA and SEA at a later date.

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

YES

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

YES

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

State monitoring

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

All 15 New Hampshire (NH) Part C FCESS local programs are monitored using the NH Leads state database system throughout the year. To verify that information in the data system is valid and reliable for this FFY19 reporting, a randomly selected sample from the Transition Monitoring report (including the months of July – November) was reviewed by the Part C State Office monitoring team for each local program. The Transition Monitoring report indicates the LEA and SEA notification date and the yes or no option to opt-out. A random sample for each local program is defined as 10% of the total number of children that transitioned to Part B during the previous fiscal year or a minimum of six records. If a discovery of noncompliance is identified in the initial data report, local programs have a 90-day pre-finding correction period to explain acceptable circumstances or demonstrate 100% compliance with Indicator 8b. If 100% compliance is not demonstrated within the 90-day pre-finding correction period, a finding of noncompliance is issued. The program with a finding of noncompliance must then engage in a corrective action plan process that includes one year of quarterly monitoring. Technical assistance is provided to local programs by the Part C State Office staff to ensure successful correction of noncompliance.  
  
Compliance with Indicator 8b is defined as notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the LEA and the SEA at least 90 days prior to a child’s third birthday for those potentially eligible for Part B preschool services. Target for Indicator 8b is 100% compliance for all local FCESS programs in NH. NH statewide compliance of 96.97% did not meet the target of 100% compliance for Indicator 8b by 3.03%. This FFY19 data of 96.87% shows slippage from FFY18 98.11% data by 1.24%. Thirteen of the 15 local programs achieved 100% compliance in the initial sample data report and review of individual child documentation. In the initial data report sample, 102 records were reviewed for FFY19 reporting and 96 were found to have timely notifications sent to both the LEA and SEA at least 90 days prior to the child’s third birthday. Three notifications were delayed due to exceptional family circumstances as these families initially opted out of the notification process and then, at a later date, requested notifications be sent. Therefore 96.97% [96/(102-3)] of children notifications to the LEA and SEA were completed within the required time period.  
  
During the monitoring review process of the data report and verification of documentation submitted, a discovery of noncompliance was identified at two local programs including: Region 2 PathWays of River Valley (PW) at 67% compliance and Region 4 Community Bridges (CB) at 89% compliance. The state reviewed subsequent data and it was determined that the PW local program achieved 100% compliance during the 90-day pre-finding correction period. A finding of noncompliance for Indicator 8b was issued to the CB local program as they did not achieve 100% compliance for notification to the LEA and SEA during the 90-day pre-finding correction period. The program CB is engaged in a corrective action plan that focuses on training an individual staff member who is identified as not following local program procedure to ensure timely data entry for Indicator 8b.  
  
Local program PW sent timely notifications to the LEA, however, PW sent two notification to the SEA 22 days late. No documentation was available to verify reason for delay. The Part C State office reviewed two months of subsequent transition data during the pre-finding correction period that included 16 records and timely notification to the LEA and SEA. The State determined PW demonstrated 100% compliance during the pre-finding correction period. As a result the program was not issued a finding of noncompliance.   
  
Local program CB sent timely notifications to the LEA, however, CB sent one notification to the SEA 30 days late due to a staff member misfiling documentation. The Part C State office reviewed two months of subsequent data during the pre-finding correction period that included 13 transition records. Notifications to the LEA were timely but one notification to the SEA was identified as late by 35 days due to staff member not following program procedure for timely SEA data entries. The State determined CB did not demonstrate 100% compliance during the pre-finding correction period and as a result was issued a FFY19 finding of noncompliance for Indicator 8b. Due to this finding, a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) was developed in partnership with the program and the Part C State office. This CAP includes local individual staff training and quarterly data monitoring by the Part C office for one year. The Part C Office provides technical assistance to the local program to ensure successful correction of noncompliance.

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

NH Part C State Office was unable to conduct onsite monitoring for FFY19 due to the COVID-19 Pandemic and the State of Emergency Stay At Home order issued on 3/13/20. The Part C State Office directed local programs to electronically submit documentation from the children’s records for the random sample identified in the program’s Transition Monitoring report. The Part C State Office monitoring team reviewed this documentation to verify compliance. COVID-19 Pandemic did not impact NH’s Indicator 8b data or performance this reporting year since the sample time period used for reporting FFY19 data was prior to when the pandemic and state emergency hit in March 2020.  
  
Noncompliance reported in FFY18 State Performance Plan (SSP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) for Indicator 8b, LEA and SEA notification, included two late notifications completed less than the 90-days prior to the child’s third birthday. One program provided staff training and achieved 100% compliance in the subsequent pre-finding data reports within the pre-finding 90-day correction period prior to the issuance of a finding of noncompliance. Although the second program also provided staff training to the issuance of a finding, subsequent pre-finding data reports indicated noncompliance and the state issued a finding.  
  
The local program Easterseals in region 10 (ES10) data was reported as 83% compliance with one late notification to the LEA and SEA. Although the notification was late, less than 90 days prior to the child’s third birthday, the notification was provided to the LEA and SEA prior to the child’s third birthday. The local program provided staff training and achieved 100% compliance in the subsequent pre-finding data reports within the pre-finding 90-day correction period prior to the issuance of a finding of noncompliance. The state identified this late notification as a discovery of noncompliance. In order to verify that the the local ES10 program was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for Indicator 8b, the state reviewed subsequent pre-finding data from NHLeads, the state’s Part C data system, during the 90-day pre-finding period. The subsequent data report included 11 records which showed all 11 notifications were sent to both the LEA and SEA 90 days or more prior to the child’s third birthday. To confirm accuracy of the NHLeads data used for verification, the program was required to submit documentation from the records of these children showing timely notifications to the LEA and SEA. Based on review of the subsequent pre-finding data report and individual child documentation, the Part C State Office determined the local ES10 program achieved compliance during the 90-day pre-finding correction period prior to issuing a finding and was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for Indicator 8b. Therefore, a finding of noncompliance was not issued to the program for Indicator 8b in FFY18 due to pre-finding data showing local ES10 program correctly implementing regulatory requirements.  
  
For the local ES10 program with a discovery of non-compliance on Indicator 8b, the state Part C staff used NHLeads, the state’s Part C data system, and individual child documentation to verify that for each instance of noncompliance involved in the FFY18 APR that the child did have a notification sent to the LEA and SEA, although late. The state Part C Office has verified that the local ES10 program with noncompliance identified in FFY18 and reported by New Hampshire under this indicator in the FFY18 APR is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

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

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

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

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

Noncompliance reported in FFY18 State Performance Plan (SSP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) for Indicator 8b, LEA and SEA notification, included two late notifications completed less than the 90-days prior to the child’s third birthday. One program provided staff training and achieved 100% compliance in the subsequent pre-finding data reports within the pre-finding 90-day correction period prior to the issuance of a finding of noncompliance. Although the second program also provided staff training to the issuance of a finding, subsequent pre-finding data reports indicated noncompliance and the state issued a finding.  
  
The local program Community Bridges (CB) data was reported as 92% compliance with one late notification to the LEA and SEA. due to a staff member misfiling documentation to be entered into the state data system. Although the notification was late, less than 90 days prior to the child’s third birthday, the notification was provided to the LEA and SEA prior to the child’s third birthday. The local program provided staff training during the pre-finding 90-day correction period prior to issuing a finding of noncompliance. In order to verify that the the local CB program was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for Indicator 8b, the state reviewed subsequent pre-finding data from NHLeads, the state’s Part C data system, during the 90-day pre-finding period. The subsequent data report included 15 transition records with two late notifications to the LEA and SEA, 87% compliance. The State determined the program did not achieve compliance for Indicator 8b during the 90-day pre-finding correction period and issued a finding of noncompliance for FFY18 reporting. The program then engaged in a corrective action plan (CAP) for one year which included one year of State quarterly data monitoring and local individual staff training. The State reviewed subsequent quarterly data reports that included 15 transition records in first quarter at 80% compliance with three late notifications, 21 records in second quarter at 95% compliance with one late notification, 25 transition records in third quarter at 100% compliance, and 15 records in the forth quarter at 100%. Through review of subsequent data reports and individual child documentation, the Part C office verified that the program was functioning at 100% compliance within one year of issuing a finding and correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for Indicator 8b.The state also provided TA to ensure completion and success of the FFY18 CAP and provided staff training.

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

For the local CB program with a finding noncompliance on Indicator 8b, the state Part C staff used NHLeads, the state’s Part C data system, and individual child documentation to verify that for each instance of noncompliance involved in the FFY18 APR that the child have a notification sent to the LEA and SEA. The state Part C Office has verified that the local CB program with a finding of noncompliance identified in FFY18 and reported by New Hampshire under this indicator in the FFY18 APR is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

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

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

## 8B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8B - OSEP Response

## 8B - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.   
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

## 8B - State Attachments



# Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator:** The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday;

B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and

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

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

**Instructions**

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child’s record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to “opt-out” of the referral. Under the State’s opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State’s Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8C - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 69.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 99.06% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services (yes/no)**

YES

| **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 96 | 102 | 99.06% | 100% | 98.04% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

New Hampshire (NH) state data system indicated that two transition conferences in FFY19 reporting period occurred less than the required 90 days prior to a child’s third birthday. This was an increase of one delayed transition conference over the FFY18 reporting data. Due to no documentation for one delayed conference, the state could not determine circumstances for late transition conference. The second late conference was due to a new staff member misunderstanding the requirement that FCESS must hold a timely transition conference if local LEA is not able to attend. The Part C office determined one staff member within two local programs contributed to NH’s FFY19 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.**

4

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

State monitoring

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

All 15 New Hampshire (NH) Part C FCESS local programs are monitored using the NH Leads state database system throughout the year. To verify that information in the data system is valid and reliable for this FFY19 reporting, a randomly selected sample from the Transition Monitoring report (including the months of July – November) for each local program was reviewed by the Part C State Office monitoring team. The Transition Monitoring report indicates the date the transition conference occurred. A random sample for each local program is defined as 10% of the total number of children that transitioned to Part B during the previous fiscal year or a minimum of six records. If a discovery of noncompliance is identified in the initial data report, local programs have a 90-day pre-finding correction period to explain acceptable circumstances or demonstrate 100% compliance with Indicator 8c. If 100% compliance is not demonstrated within the 90-day pre-finding correction period, a finding of noncompliance is issued. The program with a finding of noncompliance must then engage in a corrective action plan process that includes one year of quarterly monitoring. Technical assistance is provided to local programs by the Part C State Office staff to ensure successful correction of noncompliance.  
  
Compliance with Indicator 8c is defined as the transition conference occurring at least 90 days prior to a child’s third birthday for those potentially eligible for Part B preschool services. Target for Indicator 8c is 100% compliance for all local FCESS programs in NH. NH statewide compliance of 98.04% did not meet the target of 100% compliance for Indicator 8c by 1.96%. This FFY19 data of 98.04% shows a 1.02% decrease from FFY18 99.06%. Thirteen of the 15 local programs achieved 100% compliance in the initial sample data report and review of individual child documentation. In the initial data report sample, 102 records were reviewed for FFY19 reporting and 96 were found to have timely transition conferences occurred 90 days or more prior to the child’s third birthday. Four transition conferences were delayed due to exceptional family circumstances which included a family missing timely scheduled meeting and not returning calls to reschedule, a family declining timely dates offered due to work schedule, and families canceling timely scheduled meetings. Therefore 98.04% [(96+4)/102] of transition conferences were timely.  
  
During the monitoring review process, a discovery of noncompliance was identified in the initial data report and review of individual child documentation at two local programs including: Region 7 Easterseals (ES07) and Region 10 Easterseals (ES10) - both at 86% compliance. One transition conference within local program ES07 was completed 25 days late with no reason documented for the delay (within program control). One transition conference within local program ES10 was not timely and the reason was documented as the school requiring a surrogate parent for the LEA disposition of referral meeting (within program control). Although late, both transition conferences did occur prior to the children’s third birthdays.   
  
The Part C office reviewed subsequent data through the NHLeads data system and individual child documentation for both local programs ES07 and ES10. Subsequent data for program ES07 included 20 transition records. The state verified all 20 transition conferences were provided 90-days or more prior to the child’s third birthday. Subsequent data reviewed for program ES10 included 28 transition records. The state verified all 28 transition conferences were provided 90-days or more prior to the child’s third birthday. The Part C office determined both programs ES07 and ES10 demonstrated 100% compliance during the pre-finding correction period. As a result the programs were not issued a finding of noncompliance for Indicator 8c in FFY 2019.

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

NH Part C State Office was unable to conduct onsite monitoring for FFY19 due to the COVID-19 Pandemic and the State of Emergency Stay At Home order issued on 3/13/20. The Part C State Office directed local programs to electronically submit documentation from the children’s records for the random sample identified in the program’s Transition Monitoring report. The Part C State Office monitoring team reviewed this documentation to verify compliance. COVID-19 Pandemic did not impact NH’s Indicator 8c data or performance this reporting year since the sample time period used for reporting FFY19 data was prior to when the pandemic and state emergency hit in March 2020.  
  
Noncompliance reported in FFY18 State Performance Plan (SSP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) for Indicator 8c, Transition Conference, included one conference that occurred less than 90-days prior to the child’s third birthday. Local program Community Bridges (CB) data was reported as 92% compliance with one late transition conference. The state identified this delayed transition conference as a discovery of noncompliance. The local program provided staff training and achieving 100% compliance in the subsequent pre-finding data report and individual child documentation within the pre-finding 90-day period prior to the issuance of a finding of noncompliance.   
  
In order to verify that the local CB program was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for Indicator 8c, the state reviewed subsequent pre-finding data from NHLeads, the state’s Part C data system, during the 90-day pre-finding correction period for this local program. The subsequent data report included 15 transition records indicating all 15 transition conferences were completed 90 days or more prior to the child’s third birthday. To confirm accuracy of the NHLeads data used for verification, the local program was required to submit documentation from the records of these children showing timely completion of transition conferences.   
  
Based on review of the the local program’s subsequent pre-finding data reports and individual child documentation, the Part C State Office determined the program achieved compliance during the 90-day pre-finding correction period prior the issuance of a finding and was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for Indicator 8c. Therefore, no findings of noncompliance were issued to the local program for Indicator 8c in FFY18 due to pre-finding data showing local program correctly implementing regulatory requirements  
  
For the local CB program with a discovery of non-compliance on Indicator 8c, the state Part C staff used NHLeads, the state’s Part C data system, and individual child documentation to verify that for each instance of noncompliance involved in the FFY18 APR that the child did receive a transition conference, although late. The state Part C Office has verified that the local program with noncompliance identified in FFY18 and reported by New Hampshire under this indicator in the FFY18 APR is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

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

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

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

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

## 8C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8C - OSEP Response

## 8C - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.   
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

## 8C - State Attachments

******

# Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

**Results indicator:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.

This indicator is not applicable to a State that has adopted Part C due process procedures under section 639 of the IDEA.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

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

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

YES

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

New Hampshire Part C did not have any family complaints involved in a hearing process during FFY19.

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

This Indicator is not applicable to the State.

## 9 - Required Actions

# Indicator 10: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

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

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

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

NO

**Prepopulated Data**

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Part C State Office intentionally engages stakeholder groups. Groups are created and those chosen who are interested in or affected by significant decisions regarding the Part C System are invited to participate. Stakeholders in NH include (a) families, (b) providers, (c) Area Agencies (AAs), (d) other early childhood programs, (e) advocates, and (f) other programs serving children and their families, including but not limited to programs in areas of education, family support, and health.   
  
The Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) membership reflects federal membership requirements. Although there are some vacancies in the appointed membership that the ICC is working to fill, it is well attended by the current members. The ICC has had difficulty recruiting family members. Families are supported to participate on the ICC by reimbursement for mileage and child care to participate in meetings, work groups, and other ICC activities. Families are also supported for their participations in "Welcome to ESS" (WESS) orientation, and other times when stakeholder input may be collected. Distance participation is available through the use of technology, video conferencing, email, public hearing, and phone calls. NH is currently working on ICC family recruitment and documents to explain the importance and purpose of the ICC.  
  
Stakeholder input is gathered through stakeholder activities such as (a) group email discussions, (b) face to face meetings, (c) conference calls, and (d) web workshops to enhance decision making for the statewide system. The primary stakeholder meetings are the Quarterly FCESS Meetings and the ICC meetings which typically convene every other month. However, due to the COVID-19 Pandemic during FFY19, ICC meetings were rescheduled and moved to all virtual. Part C FCESS state and local staff participate in public awareness activities, organizations, councils, and committees as stakeholders to give and gather input throughout the year. Annual Family Outcome Surveys help the Part C system to gather family input. Strong partnership with New Hampshire Family Voices (NHFV) and Parent Information Center (PIC) enable the state staff to gather family input through their networks.   
  
The Part C State Office staff held stakeholder meetings with ICC on December 4, 2020 and FCESS Quarterly on December 9, 2020. These meetings included review of Indicator 3 data analysis and discussions of setting FFY20 targets. Both stakeholder groups agreed the decrease and slippage in outcome data for Indicator 3 was impacted by the statewide training. Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic and limited capacity during FFY19, both stakeholder groups also agreed to maintain FFY19 targets and develop new baseline and targets for FFY20 reporting. NH Part C State Office will be engaging stakeholders throughout the upcoming year in data analysis meetings for setting baselines and projecting yearly targets for all indicators in the upcoming SSP/APR FFY20 – 25 package.

**Historical Data**

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

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

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target>= | 0.00% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints** | **2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints** | **2.1 Number of mediations held** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 0 |  | 0.00% |  | 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 2019. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

## 10 - Required Actions

# Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

 

# Certification

**Instructions**

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

**Certify**

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

**Select the certifier’s role**

Designated Lead Agency Director

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

**Name:**

Kathy Gray

**Title:**

Part C Coordinator

**Email:**

kathleen.gray@dhhs.nh.gov

**Phone:**

16032713783

**Submitted on:**

04/27/21 8:05:38 AM

# ED Attachments

  