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# Introduction

**Instructions**

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

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

**General Supervision System**

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

Pennsylvania’s oversight and general supervision of local programs occurs on an ongoing basis. Each Infant Toddler Early Intervention program participates in a verification visit every four years. Seven areas are reviewed during the verification visit that cover the components of the Early Intervention program. In each of the seven areas, required indicators address compliance and program management. Verification visits include the following activities: data reviews, review of policies, individual child record reviews and observations of service delivery. Verification teams are utilized during these onsite visits and include state Bureau of Early Intervention Services and Family Supports (BEISFS) staff, Early Intervention Technical Assistance (EITA) staff, and peer reviewers. The utilization of verification teams allows BEISFS to increase or decrease the number of staff conducting verification visits based on the performance level of the local Early Intervention program and contributes to inter-rater reliability. Following the verification visits, local programs develop Quality Enhancement Plans (QEPs) that focus on the correction of noncompliance, as well as activities to enhance program quality to improve outcomes for children and families and to improve inclusive practices. BEISFS staff validate that all areas of noncompliance identified during the verification visits are corrected within a year. Additional onsite visits from BEISFS staff may occur at the discretion of BEISFS if during the verification cycle there is a significant decrease in program performance or if individual or systemic concerns arise.

BEISFS began a new determination process in January 2019. The new process uses data from the APR/SPP indicators, annual family survey, complaints, and data quality measures. The annual determination process provides a rating of meets requirements, needs assistance, needs intervention or needs substantial intervention across three areas: Strengthening Partnerships, Shared Leadership and Systemic Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices. Based on the determination results, local Early Intervention programs update their QEP to reflect improvement activities. The determination is also used to identify and provide differentiated levels of support to local programs. This allows the BEISFS to use resources in a more effective and efficient manner and have the greatest impact on program practices. Additional on-site visits from BEISFS staff may occur at the discretion of BEISFS if, during the verification cycle, there is a significant decrease in program performance or if individual or systemic concerns arise.

Pennsylvania uses a comprehensive data management system, PELICAN, that enables the review of individual child data, local program data, and statewide aggregated data. The data management system supports referral information, service coordination activities, planning information, financial management, quality measures and other reporting needs for the BEISFS. This information system generates documents (Evaluation and Plan Documents) and the information contained in these documents is used to create reports to manage the program. Rigorous analysis of the data by staff on a monthly, quarterly and annual basis allows BEISFS to ensure data driven decision making for quality improvement.

Pennsylvania ensures that a complaint management process is implemented. BEISFS staff review data from complaint investigations, mediations and due process hearings to improve the EI system. Trends are analyzed, training needs are identified and improvement strategies are implemented.

Each Infant Toddler Early Intervention program is assigned a BEISFS advisor. The assigned advisor serves as primary contact to Infant Toddler Early Intervention programs and are responsible for addressing budget issues, compliance issues, complaint issues, policy and procedural requirements and overall program performance. Each BEISFS advisor has ongoing contact with each of their assigned local programs. These contacts occur throughout the year during verification visits, validation visits, training and technical assistance visits, complaint investigations, biannual leadership meetings and monthly local regional meetings. This attention to local programs: 1) allows all BEISFS advisors and statewide management staff to be aware of program concerns and issues; 2) provides BEISFS with the ability to fulfill requirements for a comprehensive and effective general supervision system that identifies and addresses issues of noncompliance; 3) ensures the correction of noncompliance within one year; and 4) allows for the implementation of improvement strategies and enforcement strategies in a timely manner.

**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.**

The EITA system provides statewide training and technical assistance on behalf of BEISFS, and the Pennsylvania Departments of Human Services and Education. The primary recipients of EITA training and technical assistance are the local Infant Toddler and Preschool Early Intervention programs that provide supports and services to children with developmental disabilities and their families. EITA is part of PaTTAN, which provides training and technical assistance for programs serving school-age children and their families. EITA provides both statewide and regional training initiatives that are developed through the analysis of statewide data, including program verification visits and determination results, state and federal requirements, relevant research related to evidence based early intervention practices, and planning with state department staff. Statewide professional development trainings are provided across the Commonwealth when it is necessary to ensure a consistent message from the BEISFS. Family members are welcomed participants and trainers in professional development activities. Examples of current statewide training initiatives include coaching across settings, inclusive practices, Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports, autism, strategies for children with low incidence disabilities, and early language and literacy.

EITA also provides assistance in the annual development of QEPs with each Infant Toddler and Preschool Early Intervention program. The QEP is based on findings from verification visits, the determination process, BEISFS priorities, relevant research, and locally identified needs. The QEP is an ongoing process that is the result of conversations, data collection and review, research and clear identification of outcomes. The QEP focuses on specific programmatic changes or outcomes and includes information on how change will be measured. QEPs focus on providing technical assistance and building local capacity through repeated contacts with the same persons/programs to assist with program wide change. The plan is a flexible document that is updated at least annually, or as additional information or needs arise.

**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.**

Pennsylvania’s professional development system focuses on a model that ensures high quality EI services that are provided by skilled, highly qualified EI staff. The four core functions used by EITA to support BEISFS’s management of the Early Intervention system include:
1. Verification Support - providing support to the BEISFS’s verification process to ensure high-quality EI services; participation in infant toddler and preschool EI verification teams; training and technical assistance support to local programs based on verification needs and QEPs; and targeted, intensive support to select programs based on the results of the verification process or program management data analysis.
2. Policy Support - providing assistance to the BEISFS in development of policies to ensure high- quality EI services and assisting local programs in translating EI policies into practice. This is accomplished through technical assistance in developing BEISFS policy documents & reports; development of statewide leadership activities; and policy-related research and materials development,
3. Professional development support in EI core competencies - providing professional development to ensure that all EI staff have the basic competencies needed to provide high-quality EI services to children and families. This is accomplished through statewide and local workshops; online learning modules and webinars; and materials development and dissemination.
4. Professional development support for EI evidence-based practices: providing professional development activities to EI staff based on innovative evidence-based practices, designed to enhance existing high quality EI services. This is accomplished through: statewide and local training; online learning modules and webinars; and materials development and dissemination.

**Broad Stakeholder Input:**

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

Pennsylvania’s Early Intervention (EI) system has two primary stakeholder groups, one with a birth-5 focus, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), and one with a 3-21 focus, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). These two groups allow BEISFS to gather statewide stakeholder input across all ages and across all geographic regions. The Committee for Stakeholder Engagement (CSE), a workgroup of the SICC, focuses on the review of data and specifically impacts the coordination of the state's birth-5 EI system. Since FY 2019, CSE has focused on providing input on the development of Pennsylvania's SSIP. Their input included review of evidence-based practices, discussions of roll out in EI programs, review of training materials, and assistance in disseminating information and materials to their constituent groups.

Membership in the SICC and CSE is composed of parents (as co-chairs), local program administrators, EI service delivery agencies, Department of Health, legislators, Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP), American Academy of Pediatrics, higher education, and a representative of Pennsylvania’s Education for Children and Youth Experiencing Homelessness Program.

BEISFS and EITA meet with SEAP, SICC, and CSE to review the annual APR data, including a review of historic date, current year data, targets, and activities implemented during the fiscal year. SEAP, SICC and CSE make recommendations for changes or additional activities if needed. This information is used by BEISFS to update its APR plans.

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

YES

**Number of Parent Members:**

47

**Parent Members Engagement:**

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

Family members were involved in leadership roles in all four steps of the SPP/APR stakeholder feedback process described in the “Soliciting Public Input” section of this APR. BEISFS built the stakeholder process to ensure that family members were involved in the development of the process for gaining stakeholder input, and were provided multiple opportunities for group and individual feedback. BEISFS partnered with state and federally funded Parent Training and Information Centers to support individual and group opportunities for parents to provide feedback. Summaries of family stakeholder events, family feedback, and demographics can be found at: https://tiu11.padlet.org/manketell1/zdxqfnczjalmn190.

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

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

To increase the capacity to gather input from diverse groups of family members, the SPP/APR stakeholder engagement plan included a number of different steps, including 1) translating SPP Portal print resources into Spanish; 2) providing Spanish versions of the SPP Feedback Survey; 3) providing directions on how to add language captioning to online SPP indicator videos; and 4) providing a Spanish interpreter at SPP Family Forums. Additional translation services were available on request.

BEISFS and EITA staff monitored the SPP online feedback survey to ensure that comments were received from diverse groups of parents based on race, ethnicity, geographic region and role. Information on the demographics of those who had provided feedback were provided to key stakeholder groups on an ongoing basis. Summaries of family stakeholder events, family feedback, and demographics can be found at: https://tiu11.padlet.org/manketell1/zdxqfnczjalmn190.

**Soliciting Public Input:**

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

A broad, systemic plan for soliciting public input was developed and implemented to gather stakeholder input on the Infant Toddler EI indicators. All steps of the plan included an opportunity for stakeholders provide feedback on setting indicator targets, analyzing historic and current data, develop improvement strategies and evaluate indicator progress.

The first step in the plan was to convene an Executive Stakeholder Input Team. The ESI team was composed of the parent co-chair of the SICC, the professional co-chair of the SICC, the BEISFS Bureau Chief and Data Manager for the Infant Toddler EI program, Special Assistant to the Deputy Secretary for Family Engagement, BEISFS Early Intervention advisor and EITA project manager. The ESI team’s goal was to develop and monitor the process for stakeholder input. On at least a monthly basis from December 2020 to December 2021, the ESI team met or communicated through email about the progress in gathering stakeholder input.

The second step in the SPP stakeholder process was a Stakeholder Forum for members of all of BEISFS’s key advisory/stakeholder groups. Invitations to the Stakeholder Forum were sent to parent and professional members of SEAP, SICC, CSE, and members of advisory groups for children with low incidence disabilities. Each forum provided an overview of the APR Results indicators, reviewed current and historic data, and discussed proposed targets. Stakeholders were provided with small group opportunities to give feedback on the proposed targets and identify activities that would promote improvement on the indicator. Notes were taken on participant comments.

The third step in the SPP stakeholder process was a series of live Family Forums to gather input specifically from family members who currently have or in the past had a child in an Early Intervention program. Four Family Forums were held, two each on December 9 and 15, 2021. Day and evening sessions were held. The forum content was provided in a similar manner to the Stakeholder Forum and focused on family engagement indicators for Part B preschool (B\*8) and Part C (C4), Indicator B6 (Least Restrictive Environment), and Indicators C5 & C6 (Child Find). Family members were provided with small group opportunities to give feedback on the proposed targets and identify activities that would promote improvement on the indicator. Two of the Family Forums used a live Spanish interpreter.

Information on the Family Forums were disseminated through the SICC, SEAP, CSE, and Local Interagency Coordinating Councils (LICCs). Early Intervention leaders were encouraged to disseminate the information to families in their Early Intervention programs. Family Forum materials were also disseminated to parent organizations (PTIs) within Pennsylvania including the PEAL Center, Hune, Parents as Partners in Professional Development, and Competence and Confidence Partners in Policymaking EI.

The fourth step in the SPP stakeholder process was the development and dissemination of strategies for stakeholder organizations and individual stakeholders to provide individual and group feedback. A Discussion Guide was developed in both English and Spanish. It included steps that individual stakeholders could take to provide feedback. It also included information for stakeholder organizations who were interested in holding their own input forums. The information was disseminated statewide through leadership and parent meetings, at scheduled Stakeholder and Family Forums, and through email communication to stakeholder groups. It was reported that SPP feedback was gathered at LICC meetings, Early Intervention staff meetings, parent organizations, and provided to families in Early Intervention by staff. Feedback was gathered through an online survey which was available in both English and Spanish.

All of the steps in the stakeholder input process were supported through the development of an online SPP Portal (http://www.eita-pa.org/pa-spp-page/). The SPP Portal for was used as a central location for short videos describing each indicator, Discussion Guides (available in English and Spanish), links to online feedback forms, and other resources related to SPP stakeholder input. The SPP portal was used in announcements on how to give feedback. A link was provided on the SPP Portal that led to a Spanish description on the stakeholder feedback process.

In total, feedback was gathered from 207 Early Intervention stakeholders, including 47 parents

**Making Results Available to the Public:**

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

A summary of the stakeholder process and results were presented to SEAP in January 2022 and the SICC in February 2022. The summary report will be disseminated to the public in spring 2022. All details of the results of the stakeholder feedback process, including meeting agendas, notes, stakeholder feedback summaries on proposed targets and SPP/APR activities, presentation materials, and demographics of participating stakeholders will be made available to the public in spring 2022.

Further details of the stakeholder feedback process can be found at https://tiu11.padlet.org/manketell1/zdxqfnczjalmn190.

**Reporting to the Public:**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 performance of each EIS Program located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State’s submission of its FFY 2019 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State’s SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.**

Pennsylvania will continue to comply with all federal requirements for annual reporting to the public. Data from the SPP/APR are available on a statewide level and for each Infant Toddler Early Intervention program.

An announcement will be made about the availability of the updated SPP/APR on the Pennsylvania Early Childhood Education NEWS listserv, an email listserv that reaches Early Childhood/Early Intervention advocates across the state.

The BEISFS, in conjunction with the Pennsylvania State Data Center, developed a web-based dashboard that is used to disseminate updated SPP/APR data on OSEP indicators to the general public. The dashboard currently includes FFY 2005 through FFY 2019 data for each Infant Toddler Early Intervention program and will be updated to include the FFY 2020 data after submission of the SPP/ APR, but no later than 120 days from submission of the SPP/APR. Information can be found at the website: https://penndata.hbg.psu.edu /PublicReporting/EarlyIntervention/tabid/2534/Default.aspx .

The dashboard also includes a complete copy of Pennsylvania's SPP/APR on the page for each Infant Toddler Early Intervention program.

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

## Intro - OSEP Response

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

## Intro - Required Actions

# Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

**Instructions**

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 78.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 94.28% | 94.39% | 92.04% | 91.49% | 93.78% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner** | **Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 30,368 | 31,496 | 93.78% | 100% | 97.45% | Did not meet 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.***

326

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

In FFY 2020, Pennsylvania did not meet targets for Indicator 1, timeline delivery of early intervention services, although no slippage was noted. The FFY 2020 data showed that 802 infants and toddlers had services that were not delivered within 14 calendar days from the completed IFSP.

One Early Intervention program showed a percentage of timely service delivery below 80%. An additional two programs showed percentages of timely services between 94 – 95%. One Early Intervention program accounted for 35% of the children receiving late services. Twenty-seven of the Early Intervention programs had 10 or fewer records with a late IFSP, and 5 programs had no late records.

Programs with late delivery of services were not limited to a specific region of the state. Reasons for delays were primarily attributed to lack of staff to provide needed services, administrative delays, as well as weather emergencies and scheduling problems concerns at the service provider level. The restrictions imposed by COVID-19 response were also a cause of delays in service delivery.

**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).**

Pennsylvania state regulations define implementation of the IFSP services as timely when the service occurs no later than 14-calendar days from the date that the IFSP is completed. This definition supports Pennsylvania's comittment to timely services for children and their families.

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

State database

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

July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2021

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

This data reflects infants and toddlers from all geographic regions, all 48 infant/toddler early intervention programs and all infant/toddlers who had an IFSP in the reporting year. Pennsylvania continues to maintain a very high standard for local Infant Toddler Early Intervention programs regarding timeliness of service delivery. In Pennsylvania, Early Intervention services shall be initiated as soon as possible after the IFSP is completed and parents consent to services, but no later than 14 calendar days from the date the IFSP is completed, unless a later date is recommended by the team, including the family.

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

Pennsylvania’s Bureau of Early Intervention Services and Family Supports (BEISFS) assures OSEP that the data reporting in Indicator C1 is valid and reliable. While Indicator 1 data shows nearly a 4% increase over the previous year, the lasting impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic continue to impact compliance in this area.

BEISFS conducted further data analysis of Indicator C1 data and gathered input from the Infant Toddler Early Intervention program leaders. This data analysis showed that delays in timelines were due to higher rates of cancelled or no-show service delivery appointments due to family and staff illness, activities to ensure the safe delivery of EI services, and shortages of Early Intervention staff.

In order to lessen the impact of COVID-19 on Indicator C1 compliance, BEISFS provided support to local EI programs on strategies such as committing more of Service Coordinators’ time to documenting signatures, providing outreach to families to remind them of appointments, organizing virtual use of interpreters, and developing local program guidance for contracting for virtual EI services and returning to in-person EI services.

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

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 38 | 38 | 0 | 0 |

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

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

In order to verify that local Early Intervention programs with identified instances of systemic noncompliance in FFY 2019 are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for the provision of timely IFSP services, BEISFS Advisors reviewed samples of child records from EI program with identified noncompliance. The records were reviewed either through the PELICAN-EI data system or an onsite child record review. BEISFS Advisors reviewed the start date of IFSP services and any documented reason for a delay in meeting this timeline. All records reviewed showed documentation that the local EI program is now correctly implementing the regulatory requirement for timely IFSP services.

In addition to a review of child records, all local Early Intervention programs submitted a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), that addressed correction of all areas of noncompliance. All QEPs were reviewed and approved by BEISFS. Implementation of the QEP activities were validated within one year of issuance of the findings report. BEISFS Advisors reviewed documentation of completion of all QEP activities as part of the validation of correction of systemic noncompliance. Documentation included a review of updated local policies and procedures, documentation of staff training on new procedures, and observations of service delivery. BEISFS has verified that all local Early Intervention programs who had identified noncompliance in FFY 2019 are correctly implementing regulatory requirements related to the timely delivery of IFSP services, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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

For each individual case of noncompliance, BEISFS Advisors reviewed the record of the identified child, either through the PELICAN-EI data system or onsite record review and verified that the child received the services listed on the IFSP, although late. BEISFS verified that all local Early Intervention programs with individual cases of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 have begun services for each child as identified on the IFSP unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the Early Intervention program.

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

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

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

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

## 1 - OSEP Response

## 1 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 99.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target>= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Data | 99.96% | 99.19% | 99.87% | 99.91% | 99.91% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Pennsylvania’s Early Intervention (EI) system has two primary stakeholder groups, one with a birth-5 focus, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), and one with a 3-21 focus, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). These two groups allow BEISFS to gather statewide stakeholder input across all ages and across all geographic regions. The Committee for Stakeholder Engagement (CSE), a workgroup of the SICC, focuses on the review of data and specifically impacts the coordination of the state's birth-5 EI system. Since FY 2019, CSE has focused on providing input on the development of Pennsylvania's SSIP. Their input included review of evidence-based practices, discussions of roll out in EI programs, review of training materials, and assistance in disseminating information and materials to their constituent groups.

Membership in the SICC and CSE is composed of parents (as co-chairs), local program administrators, EI service delivery agencies, Department of Health, legislators, Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP), American Academy of Pediatrics, higher education, and a representative of Pennsylvania’s Education for Children and Youth Experiencing Homelessness Program.

BEISFS and EITA meet with SEAP, SICC, and CSE to review the annual APR data, including a review of historic date, current year data, targets, and activities implemented during the fiscal year. SEAP, SICC and CSE make recommendations for changes or additional activities if needed. This information is used by BEISFS to update its APR plans.

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the Interagency Coordinating Council, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress
Family members were involved in leadership roles in all four steps of the SPP/APR stakeholder feedback process described in the “Soliciting Public Input” section of this APR. BEISFS built the stakeholder process to ensure that family members were involved in the development of the process for gaining stakeholder input and were provided multiple opportunities for group and individual feedback. BEISFS partnered with state and federally funded Parent Training and Information Centers to support individual and group opportunities for parents to provide feedback. Summaries of family stakeholder events, family feedback, and demographics can be found at: https://tiu11.padlet.org/manketell1/zdxqfnczjalmn190.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

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

To increase the capacity to gather input from diverse groups of family members, the SPP/APR stakeholder engagement plan included a number of different steps, including 1) translating SPP Portal print resources into Spanish; 2) providing Spanish versions of the SPP Feedback Survey; 3) providing directions on how to add language captioning to online SPP indicator videos; and 4) providing a Spanish interpreter at SPP Family Forums. Additional translation services were available on request.

BEISFS and EITA staff monitored the SPP online feedback survey to ensure that comments were received from diverse groups of parents based on race, ethnicity, geographic region and role. Information on the demographics of those who had provided feedback were provided to key stakeholder groups on an ongoing basis. Summaries of family stakeholder events, family feedback, and demographics can be found at: https://tiu11.padlet.org/manketell1/zdxqfnczjalmn190.

Soliciting Public Input:

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

A broad, systemic plan for soliciting public input was developed and implemented to gather stakeholder input on the Infant Toddler EI indicators. All steps of the plan included an opportunity for stakeholders provide feedback on setting indicator targets, analyzing historic and current data, develop improvement strategies and evaluate indicator progress.

The first step in the plan was to convene an Executive Stakeholder Input Team. The ESI team was composed of the parent co-chair of the SICC, the professional co-chair of the SICC, the BEISFS Bureau Chief and Data Manager for the Infant Toddler EI program, Special Assistant to the Deputy Secretary for Family Engagement, BEISFS Early Intervention advisor and EITA project manager. The ESI team’s goal was to develop and monitor the process for stakeholder input. On at least a monthly basis from December 2020 to December 2021, the ESI team met or communicated through email about the progress in gathering stakeholder input.

The second step in the SPP stakeholder process was a Stakeholder Forum for members of all of BEISFS’s key advisory/stakeholder groups. Invitations to the Stakeholder Forum were sent to parent and professional members of SEAP, SICC, CSE, and members of advisory groups for children with low incidence disabilities. Each forum provided an overview of the APR Results indicators, reviewed current and historic data, and discussed proposed targets. Stakeholders were provided with small group opportunities to give feedback on the proposed targets and identify activities that would promote improvement on the indicator. Notes were taken on participant comments.

The third step in the SPP stakeholder process was a series of live Family Forums to gather input specifically from family members who currently have or in the past had a child in an Early Intervention program. Four Family Forums were held, two each on December 9 and 15, 2021. Day and evening sessions were held. The forum content was provided in a similar manner to the Stakeholder Forum and focused on family engagement indicators for Part B preschool (B\*8) and Part C (C4), Indicator B6 (Least Restrictive Environment), and Indicators C5 & C6 (Child Find). Family members were provided with small group opportunities to give feedback on the proposed targets and identify activities that would promote improvement on the indicator. Two of the Family Forums used a live Spanish interpreter.

Information on the Family Forums were disseminated through the SICC, SEAP, CSE, and Local Interagency Coordinating Councils (LICCs). Early Intervention leaders were encouraged to disseminate the information to families in their Early Intervention programs. Family Forum materials were also disseminated to parent organizations (PTIs) within Pennsylvania including the PEAL Center, Hune, Parents as Partners in Professional Development, and Competence and Confidence Partners in Policymaking EI.

The fourth step in the SPP stakeholder process was the development and dissemination of strategies for stakeholder organizations and individual stakeholders to provide individual and group feedback. A Discussion Guide was developed in both English and Spanish. It included steps that individual stakeholders could take to provide feedback. It also included information for stakeholder organizations who were interested in holding their own input forums. The information was disseminated statewide through leadership and parent meetings, at scheduled Stakeholder and Family Forums, and through email communication to stakeholder groups. It was reported that SPP feedback was gathered at LICC meetings, Early Intervention staff meetings, parent organizations, and provided to families in Early Intervention by staff. Feedback was gathered through an online survey which was available in both English and Spanish.

All of the steps in the stakeholder input process were supported through the development of an online SPP Portal (http://www.eita-pa.org/pa-spp-page/). The SPP Portal for was used as a central location for short videos describing each indicator, Discussion Guides (available in English and Spanish), links to online feedback forms, and other resources related to SPP stakeholder input. The SPP portal was used in announcements on how to give feedback. A link was provided on the SPP Portal that led to a Spanish description on the stakeholder feedback process.

In total, feedback was gathered from 207 Early Intervention stakeholders, including 47 parents.

Making Results Available to the Public:

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

A summary of the stakeholder process and results were presented to SEAP in January 2022 and the SICC in February 2022. The summary report will be disseminated to the public in spring 2022. All details of the results of the stakeholder feedback process, including meeting agendas, notes, stakeholder feedback summaries on proposed targets and SPP/APR activities, presentation materials, and demographics of participating stakeholders will be made available to the public in spring 2022.

Further details of the stakeholder feedback process can be found at https://tiu11.padlet.org/manketell1/zdxqfnczjalmn190.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age | 07/08/2021 | Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings | 19,719 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age | 07/08/2021 | Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs | 19,725 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings** | **Total number of Infants and toddlers with IFSPs** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 19,719 | 19,725 | 99.91% | 95.00% | 99.97% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

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

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

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

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

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Outcomes:

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

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

 C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

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

c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

**Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:**

**Summary Statement 1:** Of those infants and toddlers who entered early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in category (d)) divided by (# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2:**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e)) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling of****infants and toddlers with IFSPs****is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

In the measurement, include in the numerator and denominator only infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Report: (1) the number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State’s Part C exiting data under Section 618 of the IDEA; and (2) the number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements.

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.” If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Process (COS), then the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

If the State’s Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or “at-risk infants and toddlers”) under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i), the State must report data in two ways. First, it must report on all eligible children but exclude its at-risk infants and toddlers (i.e., include just those infants and toddlers experiencing developmental delay (or “developmentally delayed children”) or having a diagnosed physical or mental condition that has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay (or “children with diagnosed conditions”)). Second, the State must separately report outcome data on either: (1) just its at-risk infants and toddlers; or (2) aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C (including developmentally delayed children, children with diagnosed conditions, and at-risk infants and toddlers).

## 3 - Indicator Data

**Does your State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or “at-risk infants and toddlers”) under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? (yes/no)**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Pennsylvania’s Early Intervention (EI) system has two primary stakeholder groups, one with a birth-5 focus, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), and one with a 3-21 focus, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). These two groups allow BEISFS to gather statewide stakeholder input across all ages and across all geographic regions. The Committee for Stakeholder Engagement (CSE), a workgroup of the SICC, focuses on the review of data and specifically impacts the coordination of the state's birth-5 EI system. Since FY 2019, CSE has focused on providing input on the development of Pennsylvania's SSIP. Their input included review of evidence-based practices, discussions of roll out in EI programs, review of training materials, and assistance in disseminating information and materials to their constituent groups.

Membership in the SICC and CSE is composed of parents (as co-chairs), local program administrators, EI service delivery agencies, Department of Health, legislators, Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP), American Academy of Pediatrics, higher education, and a representative of Pennsylvania’s Education for Children and Youth Experiencing Homelessness Program.

BEISFS and EITA meet with SEAP, SICC, and CSE to review the annual APR data, including a review of historic date, current year data, targets, and activities implemented during the fiscal year. SEAP, SICC and CSE make recommendations for changes or additional activities if needed. This information is used by BEISFS to update its APR plans.

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the Interagency Coordinating Council, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress
Family members were involved in leadership roles in all four steps of the SPP/APR stakeholder feedback process described in the “Soliciting Public Input” section of this APR. BEISFS built the stakeholder process to ensure that family members were involved in the development of the process for gaining stakeholder input and were provided multiple opportunities for group and individual feedback. BEISFS partnered with state and federally funded Parent Training and Information Centers to support individual and group opportunities for parents to provide feedback. Summaries of family stakeholder events, family feedback, and demographics can be found at: https://tiu11.padlet.org/manketell1/zdxqfnczjalmn190.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

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

To increase the capacity to gather input from diverse groups of family members, the SPP/APR stakeholder engagement plan included a number of different steps, including 1) translating SPP Portal print resources into Spanish; 2) providing Spanish versions of the SPP Feedback Survey; 3) providing directions on how to add language captioning to online SPP indicator videos; and 4) providing a Spanish interpreter at SPP Family Forums. Additional translation services were available on request.

BEISFS and EITA staff monitored the SPP online feedback survey to ensure that comments were received from diverse groups of parents based on race, ethnicity, geographic region and role. Information on the demographics of those who had provided feedback were provided to key stakeholder groups on an ongoing basis. Summaries of family stakeholder events, family feedback, and demographics can be found at: https://tiu11.padlet.org/manketell1/zdxqfnczjalmn190.

Soliciting Public Input:

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

A broad, systemic plan for soliciting public input was developed and implemented to gather stakeholder input on the Infant Toddler EI indicators. All steps of the plan included an opportunity for stakeholders provide feedback on setting indicator targets, analyzing historic and current data, develop improvement strategies and evaluate indicator progress.

The first step in the plan was to convene an Executive Stakeholder Input Team. The ESI team was composed of the parent co-chair of the SICC, the professional co-chair of the SICC, the BEISFS Bureau Chief and Data Manager for the Infant Toddler EI program, Special Assistant to the Deputy Secretary for Family Engagement, BEISFS Early Intervention advisor and EITA project manager. The ESI team’s goal was to develop and monitor the process for stakeholder input. On at least a monthly basis from December 2020 to December 2021, the ESI team met or communicated through email about the progress in gathering stakeholder input.

The second step in the SPP stakeholder process was a Stakeholder Forum for members of all of BEISFS’s key advisory/stakeholder groups. Invitations to the Stakeholder Forum were sent to parent and professional members of SEAP, SICC, CSE, and members of advisory groups for children with low incidence disabilities. Each forum provided an overview of the APR Results indicators, reviewed current and historic data, and discussed proposed targets. Stakeholders were provided with small group opportunities to give feedback on the proposed targets and identify activities that would promote improvement on the indicator. Notes were taken on participant comments.

The third step in the SPP stakeholder process was a series of live Family Forums to gather input specifically from family members who currently have or in the past had a child in an Early Intervention program. Four Family Forums were held, two each on December 9 and 15, 2021. Day and evening sessions were held. The forum content was provided in a similar manner to the Stakeholder Forum and focused on family engagement indicators for Part B preschool (B\*8) and Part C (C4), Indicator B6 (Least Restrictive Environment), and Indicators C5 & C6 (Child Find). Family members were provided with small group opportunities to give feedback on the proposed targets and identify activities that would promote improvement on the indicator. Two of the Family Forums used a live Spanish interpreter.

Information on the Family Forums were disseminated through the SICC, SEAP, CSE, and Local Interagency Coordinating Councils (LICCs). Early Intervention leaders were encouraged to disseminate the information to families in their Early Intervention programs. Family Forum materials were also disseminated to parent organizations (PTIs) within Pennsylvania including the PEAL Center, Hune, Parents as Partners in Professional Development, and Competence and Confidence Partners in Policymaking EI.

The fourth step in the SPP stakeholder process was the development and dissemination of strategies for stakeholder organizations and individual stakeholders to provide individual and group feedback. A Discussion Guide was developed in both English and Spanish. It included steps that individual stakeholders could take to provide feedback. It also included information for stakeholder organizations who were interested in holding their own input forums. The information was disseminated statewide through leadership and parent meetings, at scheduled Stakeholder and Family Forums, and through email communication to stakeholder groups. It was reported that SPP feedback was gathered at LICC meetings, Early Intervention staff meetings, parent organizations, and provided to families in Early Intervention by staff. Feedback was gathered through an online survey which was available in both English and Spanish.

All of the steps in the stakeholder input process were supported through the development of an online SPP Portal (http://www.eita-pa.org/pa-spp-page/). The SPP Portal for was used as a central location for short videos describing each indicator, Discussion Guides (available in English and Spanish), links to online feedback forms, and other resources related to SPP stakeholder input. The SPP portal was used in announcements on how to give feedback. A link was provided on the SPP Portal that led to a Spanish description on the stakeholder feedback process.

In total, feedback was gathered from 207 Early Intervention stakeholders, including 47 parents.

Making Results Available to the Public:

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

A summary of the stakeholder process and results were presented to SEAP in January 2022 and the SICC in February 2022. The summary report will be disseminated to the public in spring 2022. All details of the results of the stakeholder feedback process, including meeting agendas, notes, stakeholder feedback summaries on proposed targets and SPP/APR activities, presentation materials, and demographics of participating stakeholders will be made available to the public in spring 2022.

Further details of the stakeholder feedback process can be found at https://tiu11.padlet.org/manketell1/zdxqfnczjalmn190.

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| **A1** | 2020 | Target>= | 73.13% | 73.13% | 73.13% | 74.13% | 74.13% |
| **A1** | 66.83% | Data | 71.24% | 68.29% | 68.42% | 67.85% | 68.19% |
| **A2** | 2020 | Target>= | 65.80% | 66.80% | 67.80% | 68.80% | 68.80% |
| **A2** | 56.40% | Data | 58.95% | 58.62% | 58.64% | 58.45% | 57.39% |
| **B1** | 2020 | Target>= | 80.51% | 80.51% | 80.51% | 81.51% | 81.51% |
| **B1** | 73.56% | Data | 77.85% | 75.61% | 76.25% | 75.14% | 74.50% |
| **B2** | 2020 | Target>= | 53.67% | 53.67% | 53.67% | 54.67% | 54.67% |
| **B2** | 46.17% | Data | 51.05% | 50.31% | 49.93% | 49.28% | 48.05% |
| **C1** | 2020 | Target>= | 80.56% | 80.56% | 80.56% | 81.56% | 81.56% |
| **C1** | 74.81% | Data | 77.98% | 75.64% | 75.76% | 74.92% | 74.54% |
| **C2** | 2020 | Target>= | 60.73% | 60.73% | 60.73% | 61.73% | 61.73% |
| **C2** | 54.51% | Data | 57.62% | 57.57% | 58.28% | 57.14% | 55.68% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A1>= | 66.83% | 67.00% | 67.00% | 67.00% | 67.50% | 68.00% |
| Target A2>= | 56.40% | 56.50% | 56.50% | 56.50% | 57.00% | 57.50% |
| Target B1>= | 73.56% | 74.00% | 74.00% | 74.00% | 74.50% | 75.00% |
| Target B2>= | 46.17% | 46.50% | 46.50% | 46.50% | 47.00% | 47.50% |
| Target C1>= | 74.81% | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.50% | 76.00% |
| Target C2>= | 54.51% | 55.00% | 55.00% | 55.00% | 55.50% | 56.00% |

 **FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

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

13,783

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

| **Outcome A Progress Category** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 85 | 0.62% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 3,170 | 23.08% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 2,732 | 19.90% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 3,825 | 27.85% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 3,920 | 28.55% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 6,557 | 9,812 | 68.19% | 66.83% | 66.83% | N/A | N/A |
| A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 7,745 | 13,732 | 57.39% | 56.40% | 56.40% | N/A | N/A |

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

| **Outcome B Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 99 | 0.72% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 3,005 | 21.86% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 4,295 | 31.25% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 4,343 | 31.60% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 2,002 | 14.57% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 8,638 | 11,742 | 74.50% | 73.56% | 73.56% | N/A | N/A |
| B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 6,345 | 13,744 | 48.05% | 46.17% | 46.17% | N/A | N/A |

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

| **Outcome C Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 68 | 0.50% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 2,790 | 20.33% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 3,386 | 24.67% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 5,103 | 37.18% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 2,378 | 17.33% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 8,489 | 11,347 | 74.54% | 74.81% | 74.81% | N/A | N/A |
| C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 7,481 | 13,725 | 55.68% | 54.51% | 54.51% | N/A | N/A |

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

| **Question** | **Number** |
| --- | --- |
| The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State’s Part C exiting 618 data | 20,721 |
| 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. | 4,748 |

| **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.**

Pennsylvania’s Part B/619 and Part C Early Intervention programs use the same instruments, policies and procedures for gathering the child outcome data used for indicators B7 and C3. For both Early Intervention programs, In Pennsylvania’s Early Intervention program, “comparable to same-aged peers” is defined as a score of 6 or 7 on the COS rating scale.

For both entry and exit data collection, one member of the IFSP team is designated to collect and enter the child outcome data. This designated member is also charged with involving the family in the child outcome data collection process and in reviewing all data collection and ratings with the family. All local Early Intervention programs must select an authentic assessment tool from an approved list to use for gather child development information. The information from the authentic assessment tools is used to generate the COS rating.

All child outcome COS ratings are entered into the PELICAN-EI data system. PELICAN-EI converts the 1 – 7 ratings into progress categories and summary statements. It has built in data checks to ensure quality data entry. PELICAN-EI allows for reporting at both the state and local levels.

For entry data collection, the designated member of the IFSP team has 60 days from the child’s initial IFSP date to complete the child outcome process and enter the COS rating into PELICAN-EI. The child outcome process includes: 1) completing the approved authentic assessment tool, 2) using the data from the authentic assessment tool and the publisher’s Instrument Crosswalk to understand the child’s skills in each of the three indicators, and 3) obtaining a 1 – 7 rating of the child’s skills in each of the three indicators using the Decision Tree for Summary Rating Discussions.

For exit data collection, the process described above is used to make the COS rating. The designated member of the IFSP team has 60 days from the child’s anticipated exit from the Early Intervention program to gather and enter the data into the PELICAN-EI system. Exit data is only gathered on children who have received 6 consecutive months of Early Intervention service prior to their exit, with the starting point of service being the IFSP date.

Additional policies and procedures can be found at: http://www.eita-pa.org/early-childhood-outcomes/

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

New baseline data will be set this year since the original cohort of children in the FY 2009 data are no longer representative of the children currently enrolled in the Early Intervention program. In FY 2009, due to requirements for data collection and reporting, the cohort of children who were included in the baseline were children who entered and successfully exited the Early Intervention program within one year. Only 885 children were included in baseline data.

The data reported in the FFY 2020 ECO data collection includes 13,783 infants and toddlers who represent the entire range of disability types and levels of severity. The average time that a child spends in the Infant Toddler Early Intervention program is 15 months.

The reliability and completeness of FFY 2020 data for Indicator B7, child outcome data, has been impacted by COVID-19. Pennsylvania anticipates additional impact on data in FFY 2021-22 to be reported in its February 2022 SPP/APR.

Pennsylvania is seeing an overall decrease in the percent of pairs of child outcome data from the previous fiscal year. In FFY 2019, 92% of the entry and exit pairs of child outcome data were gathered. In FFY 2020, 86% of the exiting infants and toddlers had complete entry and exit pairs of child outcome data. This decrease appears to be due to difficulty in staff being able to complete exit data through teleintervention practices.

Pennsylvania’s process for collecting child outcome data is dependent on authentic assessment tools that use child observations as the primary methodology for assessment. Due to the use of tele-intervention service delivery methodologies, EI staff are having difficulty collecting valid and reliable child outcome data. This issue is being reported during the collection of both entry and exit child outcome data.

Since COVID-19 is influencing the collection of valid and reliable entry data, Pennsylvania anticipates that there will be future data impacts when child outcome exit data is finally collected on children who had entry child outcome data collected during the COVID-19 pandemic. The different conditions used to collect entry authentic assessment data vs. exit authentic assessment data may make the comparisons of the two data points invalid.

To mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the C3 data reliability, validity and completeness, BEISFS has provided guidance on the collection of child outcome data during COVID-19 and training to Early Intervention programs.

## 3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

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

The State provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the State has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

## 3 - Required Actions

# Indicator 4: Family Involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

A. Know their rights;

B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and

C. Help their children develop and learn.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

Report the number of families to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent families participating in Part C. The survey response rate is auto calculated using the submitted data.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 4 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline**  | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A | 2006 | Target>= | 87.00% | 88.00% | 89.00% | 90.00% | 87.08% |
| A | 67.00% | Data | 88.36% | 90.34% | 89.12% | 87.08% | 96.36% |
| B | 2006 | Target>= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 94.12% |
| B | 63.00% | Data | 94.89% | 95.99% | 95.00% | 94.12% | 97.03% |
| C | 2006 | Target>= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 94.17% |
| C | 78.00% | Data | 95.16% | 95.93% | 95.85% | 94.17% | 99.51% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A>= | 94.50% | 95.00% | 95.50% | 95.50% | 96.00% | 96.00% |
| Target B>= | 96.00% | 97.00% | 97.00% | 97.00% | 97.00% | 97.00% |
| Target C>= | 97.00% | 97.00% | 97.00% | 97.00% | 97.00% | 97.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Pennsylvania’s Early Intervention (EI) system has two primary stakeholder groups, one with a birth-5 focus, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), and one with a 3-21 focus, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). These two groups allow BEISFS to gather statewide stakeholder input across all ages and across all geographic regions. The Committee for Stakeholder Engagement (CSE), a workgroup of the SICC, focuses on the review of data and specifically impacts the coordination of the state's birth-5 EI system. Since FY 2019, CSE has focused on providing input on the development of Pennsylvania's SSIP. Their input included review of evidence-based practices, discussions of roll out in EI programs, review of training materials, and assistance in disseminating information and materials to their constituent groups.

Membership in the SICC and CSE is composed of parents (as co-chairs), local program administrators, EI service delivery agencies, Department of Health, legislators, Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP), American Academy of Pediatrics, higher education, and a representative of Pennsylvania’s Education for Children and Youth Experiencing Homelessness Program.

BEISFS and EITA meet with SEAP, SICC, and CSE to review the annual APR data, including a review of historic date, current year data, targets, and activities implemented during the fiscal year. SEAP, SICC and CSE make recommendations for changes or additional activities if needed. This information is used by BEISFS to update its APR plans.

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the Interagency Coordinating Council, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress
Family members were involved in leadership roles in all four steps of the SPP/APR stakeholder feedback process described in the “Soliciting Public Input” section of this APR. BEISFS built the stakeholder process to ensure that family members were involved in the development of the process for gaining stakeholder input and were provided multiple opportunities for group and individual feedback. BEISFS partnered with state and federally funded Parent Training and Information Centers to support individual and group opportunities for parents to provide feedback. Summaries of family stakeholder events, family feedback, and demographics can be found at: https://tiu11.padlet.org/manketell1/zdxqfnczjalmn190.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

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

To increase the capacity to gather input from diverse groups of family members, the SPP/APR stakeholder engagement plan included a number of different steps, including 1) translating SPP Portal print resources into Spanish; 2) providing Spanish versions of the SPP Feedback Survey; 3) providing directions on how to add language captioning to online SPP indicator videos; and 4) providing a Spanish interpreter at SPP Family Forums. Additional translation services were available on request.

BEISFS and EITA staff monitored the SPP online feedback survey to ensure that comments were received from diverse groups of parents based on race, ethnicity, geographic region and role. Information on the demographics of those who had provided feedback were provided to key stakeholder groups on an ongoing basis. Summaries of family stakeholder events, family feedback, and demographics can be found at: https://tiu11.padlet.org/manketell1/zdxqfnczjalmn190.

Soliciting Public Input:

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

A broad, systemic plan for soliciting public input was developed and implemented to gather stakeholder input on the Infant Toddler EI indicators. All steps of the plan included an opportunity for stakeholders provide feedback on setting indicator targets, analyzing historic and current data, develop improvement strategies and evaluate indicator progress.

The first step in the plan was to convene an Executive Stakeholder Input Team. The ESI team was composed of the parent co-chair of the SICC, the professional co-chair of the SICC, the BEISFS Bureau Chief and Data Manager for the Infant Toddler EI program, Special Assistant to the Deputy Secretary for Family Engagement, BEISFS Early Intervention advisor and EITA project manager. The ESI team’s goal was to develop and monitor the process for stakeholder input. On at least a monthly basis from December 2020 to December 2021, the ESI team met or communicated through email about the progress in gathering stakeholder input.

The second step in the SPP stakeholder process was a Stakeholder Forum for members of all of BEISFS’s key advisory/stakeholder groups. Invitations to the Stakeholder Forum were sent to parent and professional members of SEAP, SICC, CSE, and members of advisory groups for children with low incidence disabilities. Each forum provided an overview of the APR Results indicators, reviewed current and historic data, and discussed proposed targets. Stakeholders were provided with small group opportunities to give feedback on the proposed targets and identify activities that would promote improvement on the indicator. Notes were taken on participant comments.

The third step in the SPP stakeholder process was a series of live Family Forums to gather input specifically from family members who currently have or in the past had a child in an Early Intervention program. Four Family Forums were held, two each on December 9 and 15, 2021. Day and evening sessions were held. The forum content was provided in a similar manner to the Stakeholder Forum and focused on family engagement indicators for Part B preschool (B\*8) and Part C (C4), Indicator B6 (Least Restrictive Environment), and Indicators C5 & C6 (Child Find). Family members were provided with small group opportunities to give feedback on the proposed targets and identify activities that would promote improvement on the indicator. Two of the Family Forums used a live Spanish interpreter.

Information on the Family Forums were disseminated through the SICC, SEAP, CSE, and Local Interagency Coordinating Councils (LICCs). Early Intervention leaders were encouraged to disseminate the information to families in their Early Intervention programs. Family Forum materials were also disseminated to parent organizations (PTIs) within Pennsylvania including the PEAL Center, Hune, Parents as Partners in Professional Development, and Competence and Confidence Partners in Policymaking EI.

The fourth step in the SPP stakeholder process was the development and dissemination of strategies for stakeholder organizations and individual stakeholders to provide individual and group feedback. A Discussion Guide was developed in both English and Spanish. It included steps that individual stakeholders could take to provide feedback. It also included information for stakeholder organizations who were interested in holding their own input forums. The information was disseminated statewide through leadership and parent meetings, at scheduled Stakeholder and Family Forums, and through email communication to stakeholder groups. It was reported that SPP feedback was gathered at LICC meetings, Early Intervention staff meetings, parent organizations, and provided to families in Early Intervention by staff. Feedback was gathered through an online survey which was available in both English and Spanish.

All of the steps in the stakeholder input process were supported through the development of an online SPP Portal (http://www.eita-pa.org/pa-spp-page/). The SPP Portal for was used as a central location for short videos describing each indicator, Discussion Guides (available in English and Spanish), links to online feedback forms, and other resources related to SPP stakeholder input. The SPP portal was used in announcements on how to give feedback. A link was provided on the SPP Portal that led to a Spanish description on the stakeholder feedback process.

In total, feedback was gathered from 207 Early Intervention stakeholders, including 47 parents.

Making Results Available to the Public:

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

A summary of the stakeholder process and results were presented to SEAP in January 2022 and the SICC in February 2022. The summary report will be disseminated to the public in spring 2022. All details of the results of the stakeholder feedback process, including meeting agendas, notes, stakeholder feedback summaries on proposed targets and SPP/APR activities, presentation materials, and demographics of participating stakeholders will be made available to the public in spring 2022.

Further details of the stakeholder feedback process can be found at https://tiu11.padlet.org/manketell1/zdxqfnczjalmn190.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The number of families to whom surveys were distributed | 22,749 |
| Number of respondent families participating in Part C  | 7,231 |
| Survey Response Rate | 31.79% |
| A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 5,768 |
| A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 6,077 |
| 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 | 5,848 |
| B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | 6,043 |
| 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 | 6,935 |
| C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn | 6,994 |

| **Measure** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2) | 96.36% | 94.50% | 94.92% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2) | 97.03% | 96.00% | 96.77% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2) | 99.51% | 97.00% | 99.16% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

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

**Survey Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Survey Response Rate | 25.23% | 31.79% |

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

For the second year, local Early Intervention programs are responsible for dissemination of survey materials to families in their program. The programs are supported with dissemination materials including a printable post card/flyer and information to use in social media postings. Training webinars are held annually to provide local Early Intervention programs with strategies to use to increase return rates. This strategy, increasing the responsibility of local Early Intervention programs in disseminating the family survey, has reversed a declining return rate and resulted in an increase of 16.3% of returned surveys. An increase in the racial representativeness of the surveys has also been noted.

To ensure that families who respond to the survey are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program, Pennsylvania monitors the respondent demographics throughout the survey time-period. Monthly reports of returned survey demographics are provided to local Early Intervention programs. This data allows local Early Intervention programs to monitor survey returns in their area and provide targeted support to families who have not yet returned surveys.
All survey materials, including the online survey itself, are available in both English and Spanish. Assistance with additional language interpretation/translations are available through the CONNECT Information Line.

Pennsylvania’s local program Determination process includes data from the annual family survey, including the three C4 questions, the Preschool Early Intervention B8 question, several other state specific survey questions, and the survey return rate. Local Early Intervention programs are held accountable for their performance on these items through the Determination process. This accountability has also played a role in increasing survey return rates.

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

On a monthly basis during the survey time period, BEISFS analyzed demographic data on returned surveys. Demographics included: geographic region, gender, race, and ethnicity. Analysis of geographic region also allows for generating response rates for each Early Intervention program. The survey data analysis was provided to local Early Intervention programs on a monthly basis to assist them in targeting efforts to increase response rates and representativeness of returned surveys.

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

On a monthly basis during the survey time period, BEISFS analyzed demographic data on returned surveys. Demographics included: geographic region, gender, race, and ethnicity. The survey data analysis was provided to local Early Intervention programs to assist them in targeting efforts to increase response rates and representativeness of returned surveys.

Using the +/-3% tolerance level established by the Response Calculator developed by the National Post School Outcome Center (NPSO), Pennsylvania analyzed seven race categories to determine the racial representativeness of the survey data. The Hispanic respondent category was over-represented by 0.08%. All other race/ethnicity categories were within tolerance levels.

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

Pennsylvania compares the race categories of returned surveys with the race of infants and toddlers in the Early Intervention program. Data is analyzed both at the local Early Intervention program and at the state levels. A +/-3% tolerance level, as established by the Response Calculator developed by the National Post School Outcome Center (NPSO), is used to determine the racial representativeness of the returned surveys.

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

## 4 - Prior FFY 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.

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

## 4 - OSEP Response

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

The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was representative of the population. However, in its narrative, the State reported, "The Hispanic respondent category was over-represented by 0.08%." Therefore, OSEP is unclear whether the response group was representative of the population.

## 4 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2021 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.

# Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 1.60% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 2.10% | 2.20% | 2.20% | 2.20% | 2.70% |
| Data | 2.21% | 2.50% | 2.64% | 2.70% | 2.79% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 2.00% | 2.20% | 2.40% | 2.60% | 3.10% | 3.20% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Pennsylvania’s Early Intervention (EI) system has two primary stakeholder groups, one with a birth-5 focus, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), and one with a 3-21 focus, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). These two groups allow BEISFS to gather statewide stakeholder input across all ages and across all geographic regions. The Committee for Stakeholder Engagement (CSE), a workgroup of the SICC, focuses on the review of data and specifically impacts the coordination of the state's birth-5 EI system. Since FY 2019, CSE has focused on providing input on the development of Pennsylvania's SSIP. Their input included review of evidence-based practices, discussions of roll out in EI programs, review of training materials, and assistance in disseminating information and materials to their constituent groups.

Membership in the SICC and CSE is composed of parents (as co-chairs), local program administrators, EI service delivery agencies, Department of Health, legislators, Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP), American Academy of Pediatrics, higher education, and a representative of Pennsylvania’s Education for Children and Youth Experiencing Homelessness Program.

BEISFS and EITA meet with SEAP, SICC, and CSE to review the annual APR data, including a review of historic date, current year data, targets, and activities implemented during the fiscal year. SEAP, SICC and CSE make recommendations for changes or additional activities if needed. This information is used by BEISFS to update its APR plans.

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the Interagency Coordinating Council, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress
Family members were involved in leadership roles in all four steps of the SPP/APR stakeholder feedback process described in the “Soliciting Public Input” section of this APR. BEISFS built the stakeholder process to ensure that family members were involved in the development of the process for gaining stakeholder input and were provided multiple opportunities for group and individual feedback. BEISFS partnered with state and federally funded Parent Training and Information Centers to support individual and group opportunities for parents to provide feedback. Summaries of family stakeholder events, family feedback, and demographics can be found at: https://tiu11.padlet.org/manketell1/zdxqfnczjalmn190.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

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

To increase the capacity to gather input from diverse groups of family members, the SPP/APR stakeholder engagement plan included a number of different steps, including 1) translating SPP Portal print resources into Spanish; 2) providing Spanish versions of the SPP Feedback Survey; 3) providing directions on how to add language captioning to online SPP indicator videos; and 4) providing a Spanish interpreter at SPP Family Forums. Additional translation services were available on request.

BEISFS and EITA staff monitored the SPP online feedback survey to ensure that comments were received from diverse groups of parents based on race, ethnicity, geographic region and role. Information on the demographics of those who had provided feedback were provided to key stakeholder groups on an ongoing basis. Summaries of family stakeholder events, family feedback, and demographics can be found at: https://tiu11.padlet.org/manketell1/zdxqfnczjalmn190.

Soliciting Public Input:

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

A broad, systemic plan for soliciting public input was developed and implemented to gather stakeholder input on the Infant Toddler EI indicators. All steps of the plan included an opportunity for stakeholders provide feedback on setting indicator targets, analyzing historic and current data, develop improvement strategies and evaluate indicator progress.

The first step in the plan was to convene an Executive Stakeholder Input Team. The ESI team was composed of the parent co-chair of the SICC, the professional co-chair of the SICC, the BEISFS Bureau Chief and Data Manager for the Infant Toddler EI program, Special Assistant to the Deputy Secretary for Family Engagement, BEISFS Early Intervention advisor and EITA project manager. The ESI team’s goal was to develop and monitor the process for stakeholder input. On at least a monthly basis from December 2020 to December 2021, the ESI team met or communicated through email about the progress in gathering stakeholder input.

The second step in the SPP stakeholder process was a Stakeholder Forum for members of all of BEISFS’s key advisory/stakeholder groups. Invitations to the Stakeholder Forum were sent to parent and professional members of SEAP, SICC, CSE, and members of advisory groups for children with low incidence disabilities. Each forum provided an overview of the APR Results indicators, reviewed current and historic data, and discussed proposed targets. Stakeholders were provided with small group opportunities to give feedback on the proposed targets and identify activities that would promote improvement on the indicator. Notes were taken on participant comments.

The third step in the SPP stakeholder process was a series of live Family Forums to gather input specifically from family members who currently have or in the past had a child in an Early Intervention program. Four Family Forums were held, two each on December 9 and 15, 2021. Day and evening sessions were held. The forum content was provided in a similar manner to the Stakeholder Forum and focused on family engagement indicators for Part B preschool (B\*8) and Part C (C4), Indicator B6 (Least Restrictive Environment), and Indicators C5 & C6 (Child Find). Family members were provided with small group opportunities to give feedback on the proposed targets and identify activities that would promote improvement on the indicator. Two of the Family Forums used a live Spanish interpreter.

Information on the Family Forums were disseminated through the SICC, SEAP, CSE, and Local Interagency Coordinating Councils (LICCs). Early Intervention leaders were encouraged to disseminate the information to families in their Early Intervention programs. Family Forum materials were also disseminated to parent organizations (PTIs) within Pennsylvania including the PEAL Center, Hune, Parents as Partners in Professional Development, and Competence and Confidence Partners in Policymaking EI.

The fourth step in the SPP stakeholder process was the development and dissemination of strategies for stakeholder organizations and individual stakeholders to provide individual and group feedback. A Discussion Guide was developed in both English and Spanish. It included steps that individual stakeholders could take to provide feedback. It also included information for stakeholder organizations who were interested in holding their own input forums. The information was disseminated statewide through leadership and parent meetings, at scheduled Stakeholder and Family Forums, and through email communication to stakeholder groups. It was reported that SPP feedback was gathered at LICC meetings, Early Intervention staff meetings, parent organizations, and provided to families in Early Intervention by staff. Feedback was gathered through an online survey which was available in both English and Spanish.

All of the steps in the stakeholder input process were supported through the development of an online SPP Portal (http://www.eita-pa.org/pa-spp-page/). The SPP Portal for was used as a central location for short videos describing each indicator, Discussion Guides (available in English and Spanish), links to online feedback forms, and other resources related to SPP stakeholder input. The SPP portal was used in announcements on how to give feedback. A link was provided on the SPP Portal that led to a Spanish description on the stakeholder feedback process.

In total, feedback was gathered from 207 Early Intervention stakeholders, including 47 parents.

Making Results Available to the Public:

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

A summary of the stakeholder process and results were presented to SEAP in January 2022 and the SICC in February 2022. The summary report will be disseminated to the public in spring 2022. All details of the results of the stakeholder feedback process, including meeting agendas, notes, stakeholder feedback summaries on proposed targets and SPP/APR activities, presentation materials, and demographics of participating stakeholders will be made available to the public in spring 2022.

Further details of the stakeholder feedback process can be found at https://tiu11.padlet.org/manketell1/zdxqfnczjalmn190.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age | 07/08/2021 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs | 2,703 |
| Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2020 | 07/08/2021 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 | 133,055 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs** | **Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2,703 | 133,055 | 2.79% | 2.00% | 2.03% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

There was a significant decrease in the number of referrals to the Infant Toddler EI program in FY 2020 as compared to FY 2019. In FY 2019, the Infant Toddler EI program received 23,528 referrals. In FY 2020, only 18,712 referrals were received, a decrease of 4,816 infants and toddlers. With fewer infants and toddlers being referred to the EI program, there will be a direct impact on the number of children who are then found eligible and enrolled.

Fewer referrals in FY 2020 were received from childcare programs, home visiting (MIECHV) programs, homeless shelters, and parent/family members. More referrals were noted from social service agencies include the Office of Children and Youth and the medical community.

In FY 2019, the primary reasons for the decrease in referrals, as identified by Local EI program leaders were: 1) closures of community referral sources due to COVID-19 (ex., early childhood programs); 2) delays in families attending well-child visits and subsequent decreases in referrals from physicians; 3) cancellations of community events used as child find activities (ex., library story times, etc.); 4) declines in referrals from Office of Children and Youth Services due to reported abuse/neglect; and 5) family perception that the Early Intervention program was not providing services during the pandemic (ex., since schools were closed, EI was closed).

The FY 2020 there appears to be some recovery in referrals to the EI program with increases in referrals from the Office of Children and Youth Services and the medical community.The reliability, validity, and completeness of FFY 2020 data for Indicator C5 has been impacted by COVID-19. Pennsylvania anticipates additional impact on data in FFY 2021-22 to be reported in February 2023 SPP/APR.
To mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the C5 data reliability, validity and completeness, BEIS/FS continues to disseminate a child find brochure to remind referral sources and families that Early Intervention services were still being provided during the pandemic. The child find brochure was widely disseminated through email lists, at professional development events for EI providers and families, through statewide stakeholder groups; and by posting it to EI websites.

In addition, local EI programs have implemented strategies to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the C5 data reliability, validity and completeness through outreach to referral sources. Examples of outreach activities include: Service Coordinators calling physician offices and explaining that EI services were being provided through tele-intervention; coordinating with local food distribution resources to distribute the child find brochure; using social media to post EI referral information; holding virtual weekly meetings with referral partners to connect about services; and updating websites to allow for online referrals.

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

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

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

## 6 - Indicator Data

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 3.30% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 4.41% | 4.41% | 4.50% | 4.50% | 5.35% |
| Data | 4.40% | 4.86% | 5.00% | 5.35% | 5.79% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 4.80% | 5.00% | 5.20% | 5.40% | 6.00% | 6.10% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Pennsylvania’s Early Intervention (EI) system has two primary stakeholder groups, one with a birth-5 focus, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), and one with a 3-21 focus, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). These two groups allow BEISFS to gather statewide stakeholder input across all ages and across all geographic regions. The Committee for Stakeholder Engagement (CSE), a workgroup of the SICC, focuses on the review of data and specifically impacts the coordination of the state's birth-5 EI system. Since FY 2019, CSE has focused on providing input on the development of Pennsylvania's SSIP. Their input included review of evidence-based practices, discussions of roll out in EI programs, review of training materials, and assistance in disseminating information and materials to their constituent groups.

Membership in the SICC and CSE is composed of parents (as co-chairs), local program administrators, EI service delivery agencies, Department of Health, legislators, Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP), American Academy of Pediatrics, higher education, and a representative of Pennsylvania’s Education for Children and Youth Experiencing Homelessness Program.

BEISFS and EITA meet with SEAP, SICC, and CSE to review the annual APR data, including a review of historic date, current year data, targets, and activities implemented during the fiscal year. SEAP, SICC and CSE make recommendations for changes or additional activities if needed. This information is used by BEISFS to update its APR plans.

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the Interagency Coordinating Council, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress
Family members were involved in leadership roles in all four steps of the SPP/APR stakeholder feedback process described in the “Soliciting Public Input” section of this APR. BEISFS built the stakeholder process to ensure that family members were involved in the development of the process for gaining stakeholder input and were provided multiple opportunities for group and individual feedback. BEISFS partnered with state and federally funded Parent Training and Information Centers to support individual and group opportunities for parents to provide feedback. Summaries of family stakeholder events, family feedback, and demographics can be found at: https://tiu11.padlet.org/manketell1/zdxqfnczjalmn190.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

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

To increase the capacity to gather input from diverse groups of family members, the SPP/APR stakeholder engagement plan included a number of different steps, including 1) translating SPP Portal print resources into Spanish; 2) providing Spanish versions of the SPP Feedback Survey; 3) providing directions on how to add language captioning to online SPP indicator videos; and 4) providing a Spanish interpreter at SPP Family Forums. Additional translation services were available on request.

BEISFS and EITA staff monitored the SPP online feedback survey to ensure that comments were received from diverse groups of parents based on race, ethnicity, geographic region and role. Information on the demographics of those who had provided feedback were provided to key stakeholder groups on an ongoing basis. Summaries of family stakeholder events, family feedback, and demographics can be found at: https://tiu11.padlet.org/manketell1/zdxqfnczjalmn190.

Soliciting Public Input:

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

A broad, systemic plan for soliciting public input was developed and implemented to gather stakeholder input on the Infant Toddler EI indicators. All steps of the plan included an opportunity for stakeholders provide feedback on setting indicator targets, analyzing historic and current data, develop improvement strategies and evaluate indicator progress.

The first step in the plan was to convene an Executive Stakeholder Input Team. The ESI team was composed of the parent co-chair of the SICC, the professional co-chair of the SICC, the BEISFS Bureau Chief and Data Manager for the Infant Toddler EI program, Special Assistant to the Deputy Secretary for Family Engagement, BEISFS Early Intervention advisor and EITA project manager. The ESI team’s goal was to develop and monitor the process for stakeholder input. On at least a monthly basis from December 2020 to December 2021, the ESI team met or communicated through email about the progress in gathering stakeholder input.

The second step in the SPP stakeholder process was a Stakeholder Forum for members of all of BEISFS’s key advisory/stakeholder groups. Invitations to the Stakeholder Forum were sent to parent and professional members of SEAP, SICC, CSE, and members of advisory groups for children with low incidence disabilities. Each forum provided an overview of the APR Results indicators, reviewed current and historic data, and discussed proposed targets. Stakeholders were provided with small group opportunities to give feedback on the proposed targets and identify activities that would promote improvement on the indicator. Notes were taken on participant comments.

The third step in the SPP stakeholder process was a series of live Family Forums to gather input specifically from family members who currently have or in the past had a child in an Early Intervention program. Four Family Forums were held, two each on December 9 and 15, 2021. Day and evening sessions were held. The forum content was provided in a similar manner to the Stakeholder Forum and focused on family engagement indicators for Part B preschool (B\*8) and Part C (C4), Indicator B6 (Least Restrictive Environment), and Indicators C5 & C6 (Child Find). Family members were provided with small group opportunities to give feedback on the proposed targets and identify activities that would promote improvement on the indicator. Two of the Family Forums used a live Spanish interpreter.

Information on the Family Forums were disseminated through the SICC, SEAP, CSE, and Local Interagency Coordinating Councils (LICCs). Early Intervention leaders were encouraged to disseminate the information to families in their Early Intervention programs. Family Forum materials were also disseminated to parent organizations (PTIs) within Pennsylvania including the PEAL Center, Hune, Parents as Partners in Professional Development, and Competence and Confidence Partners in Policymaking EI.

The fourth step in the SPP stakeholder process was the development and dissemination of strategies for stakeholder organizations and individual stakeholders to provide individual and group feedback. A Discussion Guide was developed in both English and Spanish. It included steps that individual stakeholders could take to provide feedback. It also included information for stakeholder organizations who were interested in holding their own input forums. The information was disseminated statewide through leadership and parent meetings, at scheduled Stakeholder and Family Forums, and through email communication to stakeholder groups. It was reported that SPP feedback was gathered at LICC meetings, Early Intervention staff meetings, parent organizations, and provided to families in Early Intervention by staff. Feedback was gathered through an online survey which was available in both English and Spanish.

All of the steps in the stakeholder input process were supported through the development of an online SPP Portal (http://www.eita-pa.org/pa-spp-page/). The SPP Portal for was used as a central location for short videos describing each indicator, Discussion Guides (available in English and Spanish), links to online feedback forms, and other resources related to SPP stakeholder input. The SPP portal was used in announcements on how to give feedback. A link was provided on the SPP Portal that led to a Spanish description on the stakeholder feedback process.

In total, feedback was gathered from 207 Early Intervention stakeholders, including 47 parents.

Making Results Available to the Public:

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

A summary of the stakeholder process and results were presented to SEAP in January 2022 and the SICC in February 2022. The summary report will be disseminated to the public in spring 2022. All details of the results of the stakeholder feedback process, including meeting agendas, notes, stakeholder feedback summaries on proposed targets and SPP/APR activities, presentation materials, and demographics of participating stakeholders will be made available to the public in spring 2022.

Further details of the stakeholder feedback process can be found at https://tiu11.padlet.org/manketell1/zdxqfnczjalmn190.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age | 07/08/2021 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs | 19,725 |
| Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2020 | 07/08/2021 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 | 406,678 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs** | **Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 19,725 | 406,678 | 5.79% | 4.80% | 4.85% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

There was a significant decrease in the number of referrals to the Infant Toddler EI program in FY 2020 as compared to FY 2019. In FY 2019, the Infant Toddler EI program received 23,528 referrals. In FY 2020, only 18,712 referrals were received, a decrease of 4,816 infants and toddlers. With fewer infants and toddlers being referred to the EI program, there will be a direct impact on the number of children who are then found eligible and enrolled.

Fewer referrals in FY 2020 were received from childcare programs, home visiting (MIECHV) programs, homeless shelters, and parent/family members. More referrals were noted from social service agencies include the Office of Children and Youth and the medical community.

In FY 2019, the primary reasons for the decrease in referrals, as identified by Local EI program leaders were: 1) closures of community referral sources due to COVID-19 (ex., early childhood programs); 2) delays in families attending well-child visits and subsequent decreases in referrals from physicians; 3) cancellations of community events used as child find activities (ex., library story times, etc.); 4) declines in referrals from Office of Children and Youth Services due to reported abuse/neglect; and 5) family perception that the Early Intervention program was not providing services during the pandemic (ex., since schools were closed, EI was closed).

The reliability, validity, and completeness of FFY 2020 data for Indicator C5 has been impacted by COVID-19. Pennsylvania anticipates additional impact on data in FFY 2021-22 to be reported in February 2023 SPP/APR.
To mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the C5 data reliability, validity and completeness, BEIS/FS continues to disseminate a child find brochure to remind referral sources and families that Early Intervention services were still being provided during the pandemic. The child find brochure was widely disseminated through email lists, at professional development events for EI providers and families, through statewide stakeholder groups; and by posting it to EI websites.

In addition, local EI programs have implemented strategies to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the C5 data reliability, validity and completeness through outreach to referral sources. Examples of outreach activities include: Service Coordinators calling physician offices and explaining that EI services were being provided through tele-intervention; coordinating with local food distribution resources to distribute the child find brochure; using social media to post EI referral information; holding virtual weekly meetings with referral partners to connect about services; and updating websites to allow for online referrals.

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

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

## 6 - Required Actions

# Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

**Instructions**

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 92.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 99.07% | 98.86% | 97.51% | 98.58% | 97.68% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline** | **Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 18,320 | 20,543 | 97.68% | 100% | 99.58% | 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.**

2,137

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

In FY 2020, Pennsylvania did not meet targets for Indicator C7, although no slippage was noted.

All 48 Infant Toddler EI programs had reached at least 97% of timely evaluations, assessments and IFSPs, if eligible. One program was accounted for 51 out of the 86 (59.3%) of the late timelines. All other EI programs had 4 or less instances of delayed timelines, with 26 programs having no delays.

Reasons for delays were attributed to shortages of EI staff, scheduling issues, and weather emergencies. COVID-19 had an impact on both shortages of staff and resulting scheduling issues.

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

State database

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

July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2021

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

This data reflects infants and toddlers from all geographic regions, all 48 Infant Toddler Early Intervention programs and all infants and toddlers who had an initial evaluation, assessment and initial IFSP meeting in the reporting year.

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

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

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 27 | 27 | 0 | 0 |

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

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

In order to verify that local Early Intervention programs with identified instances of systemic noncompliance in FFY 2019 are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for the provision of timely evaluation, assessment and development of an IFSP if eligible, BEISFS Advisors reviewed samples of child records from EI program with identified noncompliance. The records were reviewed either through the PELICAN-EI data system or an onsite child record review. BEISFS Advisors reviewed the child’s referral date, the evaluation/assessment date(s), the IFSP date, and any documented reason for a delay in meeting this timeline. All records reviewed showed documentation that the local EI program is now correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

In addition to a review of child records, all local Early Intervention programs submitted a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), that addressed correction of all areas of noncompliance. All QEPs were reviewed and approved by BEISFS. Implementation of the QEP activities were validated within one year of issuance of the findings report. BEISFS Advisors reviewed documentation of completion of all QEP activities as part of the validation of correction of systemic noncompliance. Documentation included a review of updated local policies and procedures, documentation of staff training on new procedures, and observations of service delivery. BEISFS has verified that all local Early Intervention programs who had identified noncompliance in FFY 2019 are correctly implementing regulatory requirements related to the timely delivery evaluations, assessments, and the development of an IFSP if eligible consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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

For each individual case of noncompliance, BEISFS Advisors reviewed the record of the identified child, either through the PELICAN-EI data system or onsite record review and verified that the child received, although late, an initial evaluation, assessment, and an IFSP, if eligible. BEISFS verified that all local Early Intervention programs with individual cases of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 have provided an initial evaluation, assessment and IFSP, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the Early Intervention program.

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

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

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

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

## 7 - OSEP Response

## 7 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

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

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 81.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 98.33% | 98.69% | 98.01% | 97.72% | 97.88% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

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

NO

**If no, please explain.**

The exits reported for 8A (N=10,134) represent all children who exited except for those with the following exit reasons: deceased, moved out of state, withdrawal by parent (or guardian), attempts to contact unsuccessful, and no longer eligible for Part C prior to reaching age three. Children referred to Part C less than 135 days prior to their third birthday were also not included in this data set.

| **Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9,640 | 10,134 | 97.88% | 100% | 98.60% | Did not meet 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.**

352

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

In FFY 2020, Pennsylvania did not meet targets for Indicator C8a, timely transition planning, although no slippage was noted.

Two EI programs are responsible for 54% of the delayed transition planning. Three EI programs had between 7 -9 delayed transition plans with the rest of the EI programs having less than four delayed plans. Programs with late transition plans were not limited to a specific region of the state.

Reasons for delays were primarily attributed to staff shortages, scheduling issues, administrative delays, reported higher rates of cancelled or no-show appointments to COVID-19 concerns, and weather emergencies. Transition planning was impacted by COVID-19 safety precautions which led to staff shortages and scheduling issues. In addition, EI leaders report an increase in the number of parents who are declining to transition to the Preschool EI program due to the uncertainties of COVID-19.

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

State database

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

July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021

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

The data reflects infants and toddlers from all geographic regions, 48 infant/toddler early intervention programs and all infant/toddlers who transitioned from the infant/toddler early intervention program.

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

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

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 29 | 29 | 0 | 0 |

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

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

In order to verify that local Early Intervention programs with identified instances of systemic noncompliance in FFY 2019 are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for the provision of timely transition plans, BEISFS Advisors reviewed samples of child records from EI program with identified noncompliance. The records were reviewed either through the PELICAN-EI data system or an onsite child record review. BEISFS Advisors reviewed the date of the transition plan and any documented reason for a delay in meeting this timeline. All records reviewed showed documentation that the local EI program is now correctly implementing the regulatory requirement for timely transition plans.

In addition to a review of child records, all local Early Intervention programs submitted a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), that addressed correction of all areas of noncompliance. All QEPs were reviewed and approved by BEISFS. Implementation of the QEP activities were validated within one year of issuance of the findings report. BEISFS Advisors reviewed documentation of completion of all QEP activities as part of the validation of correction of systemic noncompliance. Documentation included a review of updated local policies and procedures, documentation of staff training on new procedures, and observations of service delivery. BEISFS has verified that all local Early Intervention programs who had identified noncompliance in FFY 2019 are correctly implementing regulatory requirements related to the timely development of transition plans, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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

For each individual case of noncompliance, BEISFS Advisors reviewed the record of the identified child, either through the PELICAN-EI data system or onsite record review and verified that the child received a transition plan, although late. BEISFS verified that all local Early Intervention programs with individual cases of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 have developed a transition plan unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the Early Intervention program.

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

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

## 8A - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

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

## 8A - OSEP Response

## 8A - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

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

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8B - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 97.00% |

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

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

| **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 20,721 | 20,721 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Number of parents who opted out**

**This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.**

0

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

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

Data was collected for this indicator for infant toddler Early Intervention through a statewide data collection for the period of July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020. In Pennsylvania, the eligibility criteria for both Part C and Part B preschool programs are similar. For this reason, all children within Pennsylvania's Part C program are considered potentially eligible for Part B preschool programs.

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

NO

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

State database

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

July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2021

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

The data reflects infants and toddlers from all geographic regions, 48 infant/toddler early intervention programs and all infant/toddlers who transitioned from the infant/toddler early intervention program.

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

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

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

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

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

## 8B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8B - OSEP Response

## 8B - Required Actions

# Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

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

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8C - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 83.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 98.38% | 98.45% | 98.24% | 97.99% | 96.36% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

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

NO

**If no, please explain.**

The number of exits reported for 8C (N=10,134) represent all children who exited except for those with the following exit reasons: deceased, moved out of state, withdrawal by parent (or guardian), attempts to contact unsuccessful, and no longer eligible for Part C prior to reaching age three. Children referred to Part C less than 135 days prior to their third birthday were also not included in this data set.

| **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8,346 | 10,134 | 96.36% | 100% | 98.84% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference**

**This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.**

291

**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.**

1,383

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

In FFY 2020, Pennsylvania did not meet targets for Indicator C8c, timely transition meeting, although no slippage was noted. Further analysis of the child outcome data, both with state-level and local data, was conducted to determine the cause for the slippage.

Forty-six out of the 48 Infant Toddler EI programs were on-time for transition meetings at least 95% of the time. Three EI programs are responsible for 42% of the delayed transition meetings. Reasons for delays were primarily attributed to staff shortages, scheduling issues, administrative delays, and weather emergencies. Transition planning was impacted by COVID-19 safety precautions which led to staff shortages and scheduling issues.

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

State database

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

July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2021

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

The data reflects infants and toddlers from all geographic regions, 48 infant/toddler early intervention programs and all infant/toddlers who transitioned from the infant/toddler early intervention program.

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

The reliability and validity of FFY 2020 data for Indicator C8c was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Pennsylvania anticipates additional impact on data in FFY 2021-22 to be reported in February 2023 SPP/APR.

Data analysis, including stakeholder group input from Infant Toddler EI program leaders has identified the following impacts due to COVID-19: difficulty in obtaining parental signatures, reported higher rates of cancelled or no-show appointments to COVID-19 concerns, and staff shortages. In addition, EI leaders report an increase in the number of parents who are declining to transition to the Preschool EI program due to the uncertainties of COVID-19.

To mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the C8a data reliability and validity, BEIS/FS has 1) provided guidance on accepting digital signatures for parent consent and 2) provided fiscal support for purchasing of online programs to capture digital signatures.

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

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 32 | 32 | 0 | 0 |

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

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

In order to verify that local Early Intervention programs with identified instances of systemic noncompliance in FFY 2019 are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for the provision of timely transition conferences, BEISFS Advisors reviewed samples of child records from EI program with identified noncompliance. The records were reviewed either through the PELICAN-EI data system or an onsite child record review. BEISFS Advisors reviewed the date of the transition conference and any documented reason for a delay in meeting this timeline. All records reviewed showed documentation that the local EI program is now correctly implementing the regulatory requirement for timely transition conferences.

In addition to a review of child records, all local Early Intervention programs submitted a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), that addressed correction of all areas of noncompliance. All QEPs were reviewed and approved by BEISFS. Implementation of the QEP activities were validated within one year of issuance of the findings report. BEISFS Advisors reviewed documentation of completion of all QEP activities as part of the validation of correction of systemic noncompliance. Documentation included a review of updated local policies and procedures, documentation of staff training on new procedures, and observations of service delivery. BEISFS has verified that all local Early Intervention programs who had identified noncompliance in FFY 2019 are correctly implementing regulatory requirements related to timely transition conferences, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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

For each individual case of noncompliance, BEISFS Advisors reviewed the record of the identified child, either through the PELICAN-EI data system or onsite record review and verified that a transition conference was held for the child, although late. BEISFS verified that all local Early Intervention programs with individual cases of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 held a transition conference unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the Early Intervention program.

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

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

## 8C - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

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

## 8C - OSEP Response

## 8C - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

**Results indicator:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures under section 615 of the IDEA are adopted). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

YES

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

Since Pennsylvania has reported fewer than ten resolution sessions in FFY 2020, it is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

## 9 - Required Actions

# Indicator 10: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

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

NO

**Prepopulated Data**

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Pennsylvania’s Early Intervention (EI) system has two primary stakeholder groups, one with a birth-5 focus, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), and one with a 3-21 focus, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). These two groups allow BEISFS to gather statewide stakeholder input across all ages and across all geographic regions. The Committee for Stakeholder Engagement (CSE), a workgroup of the SICC, focuses on the review of data and specifically impacts the coordination of the state's birth-5 EI system. Since FY 2019, CSE has focused on providing input on the development of Pennsylvania's SSIP. Their input included review of evidence-based practices, discussions of roll out in EI programs, review of training materials, and assistance in disseminating information and materials to their constituent groups.

Membership in the SICC and CSE is composed of parents (as co-chairs), local program administrators, EI service delivery agencies, Department of Health, legislators, Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP), American Academy of Pediatrics, higher education, and a representative of Pennsylvania’s Education for Children and Youth Experiencing Homelessness Program.

BEISFS and EITA meet with SEAP, SICC, and CSE to review the annual APR data, including a review of historic date, current year data, targets, and activities implemented during the fiscal year. SEAP, SICC and CSE make recommendations for changes or additional activities if needed. This information is used by BEISFS to update its APR plans.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 100.00% |

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

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints** | **2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints** | **2.1 Number of mediations held** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |

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

Since Pennsylvania has reported fewer than ten mediations in FFY 2020, it is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

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

## 10 - Required Actions

# Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

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

*Phase I: Analysis*:

- Data Analysis;

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

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

- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and

- Theory of Action.

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

- Infrastructure Development;

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

- Evaluation.

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

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

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

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

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

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

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

A. Data Analysis

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

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

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

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

C. Stakeholder Engagement

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

Additional Implementation Activities

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

## 11 - Indicator Data

**Section A: Data Analysis**

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

Families of Infants, toddlers and preschoolers with IFSP/IEPs will have the confidence and capacity to help their children develop the skills needed to succeed in home, community, early childhood, and school settings.

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

YES

**Provide a description of the system analysis activities conducted to support changing the SiMR.**

To support the changes in the SiMR, Pennsylvania reviewed and updated the system analysis it conducted during Phase I of the SSIP. Using "A System Framework for Building High-Quality Early Intervention and Preschool Special Education Programs" (Early Childhood TA Center, (2015), the Coaching Executive Team reviewed all areas of the framework as part of the development of the coaching implementation plan. Areas of strength and need identified in the framework, were incorporated into the coaching implementation plan to support the sustainability of coaching strategies. A summary of the updated infrastructure analysis can be found at https://tiu11.padlet.org/manketell1/SSIP.

**Please list the data source(s) used to support the change of the SiMR**.

Pennsylvania’s original SiMR was measured by combining the Part C and Part B 619 child outcome data for summary statement #1 related to positive social emotional skills, including social relationships. This data best measured the program improvement strategies focused on the SiMR of increasing the social emotional skills of infants, toddlers and preschoolers in the Early Intervention program. In addition, supplemental data was reported each year to document progress.

Given the evolution of the SiMR from a direct focus on child development to the current SiMR, which focuses on the development of family skills to support their child, new data sources were needed. The primary source for measurement of the SiMR is C4 and B8 Family Engagement data. Additional progress data for the FFY 2020 SiMR will includes descriptive data of professional development activities, demographic data of families and EI staff participating in EI sessions using coaching strategies, a family self-assessment of skills, ratings of videos of family coaching sessions, and measurement of coaching fidelity.

These progress measures focus on the coaching process, the development of coaching skills by the EI provider, and the development of the family member’s skills, and therefore provide better data sources for measurement of the FFY 2020 SiMR.

**Provide a description of how the State analyzed data to reach the decision to change the SiMR.**

All of the SiMR data has been analyzed by the SSIP Evaluation Team on an on-going basis since the FFY 2014 SSIP Phase II submission. While members of the team have changed, the team continued to meet and report on SiMR data through the Annual Performance Report.

As evidence of the effectiveness of the evidence-based practices of coaching continued to grow, an additional team, the Coaching Executive Team was convened to support the efforts to scale-up of Pennsylvania’s coaching efforts. This team is comprised of leadership staff from BEISFS and EITA, and includes a national coaching expert. The Coaching Executive Team has been meeting monthly since June 2019.

The goal of the Coaching Executive Team is to develop Pennsylvania’s coaching implementation plan. Using previous SiMR data and the updated infrastructure analysis, the Coaching Executive Team developed a plan, using Implementation Science principles, with the goal of using coaching strategies as the universal approach to the delivery of Infant Toddler and Preschool Early Intervention services in Pennsylvania. The plan, which began roll out in Infant Toddler Early Intervention programs in FFY 2019, is focused on ensuring the sustainability of coaching in Early Intervention. Starting in FFY 2022, the Preschool Early Intervention programs will begin activities at the Exploration phase of the coaching roll out.

**Please describe the role of stakeholders in the decision to change the SiMR.**

The Committee of Stakeholder Engagement (CSE) was used to advise the Coaching Executive Team through a data-informed decision making process. CSE members include the parent and professional co-chairs of the State Interagency Coordinating Council, leaders from Infant Toddler and Preschool Early Intervention programs, administrators of local Early Intervention provider agencies, parent leaders, representatives from Institutes of Higher Education, and others. CSE has met quarterly since 2019 to review materials, provide input on selection of Early Intervention programs to begin participation, discuss training schedules, review fidelity measures, and to review progress data.

In Fall 2021, broad stakeholder input was gathered on the proposed changes to the SiMR and it’s targets. Input was gathered through an advisory committee forum and an online survey, available in both English and Spanish. The online survey provided an opportunity for local organizations and individuals to provide feedback without having to participate in a scheduled forum. The information about the process for providing feedback was disseminated statewide through leadership and parent meetings, at scheduled Stakeholder and Family Forums, and through email communication to stakeholder groups. It was reported that SPP feedback was gathered at LICC meetings, Early Intervention staff meetings, parent organizations, and provided to families in Early Intervention by staff.

Further details on the stakeholder process can be found in the introductory section of this APR.

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

NO

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

YES

**Please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.**

Three changes to the SiMR dictated the need for an update to Pennsylvania’s Theory of Action.

The primary change in the Theory of Action is due to the broadening of the SiMR to focus on skill development for the family members who are being supported by their Early Intervention Coach. Through the use of coaching strategies, the family members are taught strategies to help their child increase their developmental skills. It moves the focus from the direct changes in child skills, to the change in family skills to support their child.
The second change to the Theory of Action is due to Pennsylvania’s decision to broaden its focus from just the child’s social emotional/social relationship skills to all areas of child development. Coaching is an evidence-based practice that has been shown to have an impact on all areas of child development. Therefore, to focus solely on increasing social emotional skill development, seemed to dilute the potential impact of the use of coaching.

The final change to the Theory of Action was to use Pennsylvania’s SSIP resources to focus primarily on the implementation and sustainability of coaching strategies in both Infant Toddler and Preschool Early Intervention programs. While the work of implementing PaPBS and training efforts to increase the quality of child outcome data will continue, these efforts will no longer be part of the SSIP.

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

https://tiu11.padlet.org/manketell1/SSIP

Progress toward the SiMR

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

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

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 81.17% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= | 81.17% | 81.50% | 82.00% | 82.00% | 82.50% | 83.00% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # Part C and Part B/619 families who SA or VSA with survey item | # Part C and Part B/619 families who responded to survey item | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 11,214 | 13,816 |  | 81.17% | 81.17% | N/A | N/A |

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

The data source of Pennsylvania’s SiMR is the annual Early Intervention Family Survey. The survey item used to measure progress on the SiMR is “Early Intervention staff worked with my family to develop ideas and strategies to help my child learn”.

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

Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C and Part B 619 who strongly agree or very strongly agree with the statement “Early Intervention staff worked with my family to develop ideas and strategies to help my child learn”) divided by the respondent families in Part C and Part B 619)] times 100.

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

YES

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

Due to the updated infrastructure analysis and new SiMR, Pennsylvania limited progress data has been collected thus far. The updated evaluation plan describes the data to be collected and analyzed in future reporting periods.

Examples of additional data to be collected include: descriptive data of professional development activities, demographic data of families and EI staff participating in EI sessions using coaching strategies, a family self-assessment of skills, ratings of videos of family coaching sessions, and measurement of coaching fidelity.

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

NO

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

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

YES

**If yes, please provide the following information: a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan; a rationale or justification for the changes; and, a link to the State’s current evaluation plan****.**

Due to the updated infrastructure analysis and new SiMR, Pennsylvania has developed a new evaluation plan that aligns with the newly targeted infrastructure areas, new long term and short-term goals, and new SSIP activities.

The new evaluation plan includes data collection analysis such as descriptive summaries of professional development (PD) events, demographic data on participants in PD events, and participant knowledge gains. Data on the fidelity measures, including pre/post reviews of videotapes, demographic data on participants who reach fidelity, and data to assist in identifying the key coaching supports that increase the likelihood of reaching fidelity.

The new evaluation plan also describes the evaluation strategies that will be used to measure the impact of state guidance documents and monitoring procedures on ensuring sustainability of coaching.

Demographic and survey data will be gathered from family members whose children are receiving Early Intervention services using coaching strategies. The survey will include family responses to the SiMR survey item (Early Intervention staff worked with my family to develop ideas and strategies to help my child learn). This will allow Pennsylvania to compare statewide scores against scores from families who are receiving coaching services. The survey will also include research-based questions focused on the knowledge and skills gained by families through the coaching process.

The new evaluation plan can be found at https://tiu11.padlet.org/manketell1/SSIP

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

The infrastructure improvement activities for the Governance and Accountability and Professional Development areas are described below.

Professional Development and Coaching Support Activities

1. PD for Infant Toddler EI Programs in the Exploration Phase
• Eleven Infant Toddler EI Programs (Cohort 3) began the Exploration Phase in FFY 2020
• All 11 EI programs convened a Core Leadership Team (CLT). All members participated in four webinars on coaching, held monthly CLT meetings, conducted a local needs assessment, and developed an action for implementing coaching.
• Each CLT identified 5 Early Interventionists to receive training to achieve fidelity as an EI Coach during the Installation Phase

2. PD for Infant Toddler EI Programs in the Installation Phase
• The 13 Infant Toddler EI Programs (Cohort 2) who had completed the Exploration Phase in FFY 2019, began the Installation Phase in FFY 2020.
• All 13 CLTs continued to meet and attend training webinars with Early Interventionist who were receiving training to reach fidelity as an EI Coach.
• Early Interventionists, participated in a Welcome Webinar (August 2020), completed the nine-hour SS-OO-PP-RR and 5Q online modules (September – October) and four Applying Knowledge Webinars (October to November 2020).
• The average pre-test score for Early Interventionists taking the FGRBI modules was 62.7%. The average post score was 86.1%.
• Ninety-six percent (96%) of the Early interventionists participating in the Applying Knowledge Webinars agreed that “Focusing on the specific practices and principles of the Key Indicators helped me to apply them to my own practice.”
• Ninety-one percent (91%) of the Early Interventionists participating in the online modules agree that “The FGBRI online modules as a component of the Installation PD process contributed to or reinforced my learning.”
• In September 2020, all Early Interventionists recorded and submitted a baseline video of an EI session for review and feedback.
• From December 2020 – May 2021, all Early Interventionists participated in Professional Learning Communities (PLC) where they shared video clips of their coaching practice and received feedback on skills development.
• Of the 46 Early Interventionists participating in the PLCs, 100% rated the overall PLC experience (monthly content webinars with video discussion as Excellent or Very Good. In addition, 100% of participants rated the PLC as a component of the installation PD process contributed to my understanding of FGRBI and coaching using the Key Indicators with families as Excellent or Very Good.
• By June 2021, Early Interventionists submitted a final video of an EI session that was used to measure progress toward fidelity.
• All Early Interventionists reached fidelity as an Early Intervention Coach in October 2020.
• From the pool of Early Interventionists who reached fidelity as an EI Coach, the CLTs nominated EI Coaches to receive training to achieve fidelity as a Provider Trainee Coach.

3. PD for Infant Toddler EI Programs in the Implementation Phase
• Six Infant Toddler EI Programs (Cohort 1) participated in the Implementation Phase during FFY 2020.
• All 6 CLTs continued to meet on a monthly basis and attend webinars if updated information was being presented.
• Six Provider Trainee Coaches attended a Welcome Webinar (August), completed TORSH Talent Workflows Modules, and participated in monthly content webinars with Master Coach.
• The Provider Trainee Coaches who achieved fidelity in scoring coaching videos on the FGRBI Key Indicators conducted monthly coaching feedback sessions with Early Interventionists in their county.
• Five of the Six Provider Trainee Coaches reached fidelity as a Provider Coach by October 2021.
• An additional 13 Early Interventionists reached fidelity as an Early Intervention Coach through coaching sessions with the Trainee Coaches by June 30, 2021.

Governance and Accountability
1. Develop guidance documents and activities to better support coaching efforts
• BEISFS approved a new guidance document, "Early Intervention Service Delivery: Coaching Across Settings", on November 30, 2020. The announcement was disseminated to all Infant Toddler and Preschool EI programs.
• A 1-hour online course, "Early Intervention Service Delivery: Coaching Across Settings", which reviews the requirements of the guidance document, is in the final stages of development and will be posted online in August 2021.
• A series of five short webinars have been scheduled for August 2021. The webinars will provide information on how EI leaders can support their staff in completing the course and will provide information on how to access the course.
• BEISFS has required all EI programs direct service and administrative staff must complete the online course by June 2022.

2. Continue to hold Coaching Executive Meetings
• Coaching Executive Meetings continued throughout FFY 2020-21.

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

The short-term outcomes for the two areas of systems framework achieved in FFY 2020, Governance and Professional Development, have been described in the previous section. Implementation of goals for the third area of the systems framework, Family Engagement, will begin in FFY 2021 and are described in the section on next steps.

The Active Implementation Science model, one of the evidence-based practices being implemented through SiMR activities, describes the Implementation Drivers that are key to ensuring positive outcomes from systems change activities. Effective implementation can be assured by addressing Competency Drivers (selection, training, and coaching), Leadership, and Organizational Drivers (systems interventions, facilitative administration, and decision support data systems).

Pennsylvania’s SiMR was designed to ‘map’ the Implementation Science Drivers to infrastructure improvement activities: Competency Drivers to the Professional Development infrastructure area and Leadership and Organizational Drivers to the Guidance and Accountability infrastructure area. Pennsylvania has added a third infrastructure area, Family Engagement, to ensure that family members, as key stakeholders in the shift to the use of coaching as the universal strategy for delivering EI services, are provided with information about the SiMR activities and opportunities for feedback.

The second evidence-based practice, coaching using the FGRBI model, also supports systems change activities within the Professional Development infrastructure area. The FGRBI model includes a professional development curriculum that is based on adult learning principles and well-researched fidelity measures that will ensure the quality of EI services provided through a coaching model.

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

NO

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

The following activities for each infrastructure improvement strategy are anticipated to be attained in FFY 2021.

Professional Development and Coaching Support Activities
1. PD for Infant Toddler EI Programs in the Exploration Phase
• Nine Infant Toddler EI programs (Cohort 4) will begin the PD activities in the Exploration Phase
• Each Infant Toddler program will identify Core Leadership Team members and begin CLT activities

2. PD for Infant Toddler EI Programs in the Installation Phase
• Eleven Infant Toddler EI Programs (Cohort 3) will begin the Installation Phase.
• The Early Interventionists who were nominated to be trained as EI Coaches will begin the Installation PD series.

3. PD for Infant Toddler EI Programs in the Implementation Phase
• Thirteen Infant Toddler EI Programs (Cohort 2) will begin the Implementation Phase.
• Those EI Coaches who reached fidelity and who were nominated to be Provider Trainee Coaches will begin the Implementation PD series.
• Provider Coaches who have reached fidelity and who were nominated to be a Master Coach will begin their PD series.

Governance and Accountability
1. Develop guidance documents and activities to better support coaching efforts
• By June 2022, all Infant Toddler Early Intervention providers will have completed the Early Intervention Service Delivery: Coaching Across Settings
• Work will begin to update the EI Provider Registry to allow for uploading training certificates to document completion of the EI service delivery course

2. Update verification/monitoring tool to better support coaching efforts
• Identify team to review EI verification tool and process and identify strategies to incorporate accountability for coaching goals
• Update verification tool with additional items to support the use of coaching as the universal EI service delivery model.

3. Continue to hold Coaching Executive Meetings
• Meet on a bi-monthly basis with Part C Coordinator, BEISFS Bureau Chiefs, Director and Project Managers of Early Intervention Technical Assistance, and outside expert consultant.
• Hold Coaching Executive Subcommittee meetings as needed (ex., evaluation team, communications team, etc.)

4. Continue to engage stakeholders in Coaching efforts
• Hold quarterly meetings with Committee for Stakeholder Engagement meetings CSE to review new policies, new materials, PD schedules, and implementation data
• Provide updates on coaching efforts at SICC, SEAP, EI Providers’ Association board meetings, parent organizations and other groups as requested
• Continue to recruit family members of children receiving Early Intervention services as part of stakeholder groups.

Family Engagement
1. Continue to provide information to families in Early Intervention on the effectiveness of the coaching roll out.
• Develop and disseminate new materials on coaching, its goals, and its impact on Early Intervention services and child development.
• Provide coaching information to parent support groups, parent training institutes, and other parent organizations

2. Collect data from family members receiving EI services using coaching
• Collect family survey data from families who are receiving EI services from trainee coaches working toward fidelity as an EI Coach or Provider Coach.
• Analyze family data on an ongoing basis in order to respond to identified concerns

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

Two different evidence based practices were chosen for use in achieving Pennsylvania’s SIMR. One evidence-based practice, Family Guided Routines Based Intervention (FGRBI) is used for the PD content and fidelity measures of coaching strategies. The other evidence-based practice, Implementation Science, is used to guide the implementation process. These two practices will be used for Pennsylvania’s SSIP for FFY 2020-2025.

Both evidence-based practices have extensive peer-review research to support their use as an evidence-based practice. In 2004, the first databased publication validating the impact of FGRBI on caregivers and children was published in the Journal of Early Intervention. Since then, over 20 additional single case design, quasi-experimental, and randomized control studies have been conducted and reported on the FGRBI model. The field of Implementation Science has a rich research-base of evidence that supports its use in achieving program outcomes.

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

FGRBI is an Early Intervention approach that incorporates the Part C IDEA legal mandates and guidelines to promote child-directed learning into the functional everyday routines and activities of young children and their families. Caregiver coaching has been added to the model to facilitate the shift from the EI provider working directly with the child to focus on the triadic nature of the provider supporting the parent and child interactions and embedded intervention in everyday routines, activities, and play. Coaching by providers to embed intervention is related to increased parent/caregiver implementation and intentional use of specific actions or strategies that enhance their child’s development. Additional information on FGRBI can be found at http://fgrbi.com/.

The active implementation science model, as developed by the National Implementation Research Network, will be incorporated into Pennsylvania’s SSIP efforts. The NIRN work focuses on the use of implementation stages, implementation drivers, assessment of fidelity, and sustainability strategies as tools for ensuring effective implementation of system change. The NIRN model includes application tools, resource materials, and planning tools to assist in implementing new practices. Additional information on the NIRN model can be found at https://nirn.fpg.unc.edu/.

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

The FGRBI model, as an evidence-based practice, will be used to support all professional development activities and coaching supports. The curriculum, tools, and fidelity measures will be used to ensure that EI providers develop expertise in implementing coaching practices in the provision of EI services. The use of the FGRBI model to improve staff practices in coaching will result in increasing family members’ competence and confidence in embedding learning strategies in their child’s typical activities and routines.

The Active Implementation Science principles, in particular the Implementation Drivers, guided the design of the SiMR goals and strategies. The SiMR strategies focus on ensuring statewide leadership and regulatory support for the use of coaching in EI service delivery, focus on promoting leadership from local EI programs, and including stakeholder input in all SiMR activities. These strategies will ensure the effective implementation of coaching as a universal EI service delivery model.

The combination of both evidence based practices, FGRBI and Implementation Science, will ensure that Pennsylvania reaches is SiMR.

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

Full details of data to be collected to monitor the fidelity of implementation can be found in the evaluation plan (https://tiu11.padlet.org/manketell1/SSIP). Since Pennsylvania is in the first year of implementation strategies for its new SiMR, data to monitor the fidelity of implementation will be reported in subsequent years.

The FGRBI Coaching Checklist will be used to measure whether Early Intervention staff have reached fidelity as an Early Intervention Coach, Provider Coach or Master Coach. The Coaching Checklist relies on the scoring videos of EI service delivery sessions were coaching strategies are used.

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

Because Pennsylvania is reporting on the first year of implementation of its new SiMR, little progress monitoring data is available. Some descriptive statistics can be found in the section on the improvement strategies implemented in FFY 2020. Additional information on data to be gathered in future years can be found in the evaluation plan.

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

A summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practice can be found in the section on the next steps for infrastructure improvement strategies. In that section, the Professional Development strategies are the next steps for the use of the FGRBI model. All of the infrastructure areas use Implementation Science to promote effective implementation and the next steps listed reflect the next steps in the use of Implementation Science.

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

In FFY 2020, Pennsylvania analyzed data from previous SSIP activities and determined the need for a new SIMR. A new Theory of Action and Infrastructure Analysis led to the development of a new implementation plan and evaluation plan. FFY 2020 is the first year of reporting on that new SiMR and the impact of its implementation. No changes to activities, strategies or timelines are needed at this stage of implementation.

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

Description of Stakeholder Input

Pennsylvania’s Early Intervention (EI) system has two primary stakeholder groups, one with a birth-5 focus, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), and one with a 3-21 focus, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). These two groups allow BEISFS to gather statewide stakeholder input across all ages and across all geographic regions. The Committee for Stakeholder Engagement (CSE), a workgroup of the SICC, focuses on the review of data and specifically impacts the coordination of the state's birth-5 EI system. Since FY 2019, CSE has focused on providing input on the development of Pennsylvania's SSIP. Their input included review of evidence-based practices, discussions of roll out in EI programs, review of training materials, and assistance in disseminating information and materials to their constituent groups.

Membership in the SICC and CSE is composed of parents (as co-chairs), local program administrators, EI service delivery agencies, Department of Health, legislators, Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP), American Academy of Pediatrics, higher education, and a representative of Pennsylvania’s Education for Children and Youth Experiencing Homelessness Program.

BEISFS and EITA meet with SEAP, SICC, and CSE to review the annual APR data, including a review of historic date, current year data, targets, and activities implemented during the fiscal year. SEAP, SICC and CSE make recommendations for changes or additional activities if needed. This information is used by BEISFS to update its APR plans.

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the Interagency Coordinating Council, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress
Family members were involved in leadership roles in all four steps of the SPP/APR stakeholder feedback process described in the “Soliciting Public Input” section of this APR. BEISFS built the stakeholder process to ensure that family members were involved in the development of the process for gaining stakeholder input and were provided multiple opportunities for group and individual feedback. BEISFS partnered with state and federally funded Parent Training and Information Centers to support individual and group opportunities for parents to provide feedback. Summaries of family stakeholder events, family feedback, and demographics can be found at: https://tiu11.padlet.org/manketell1/zdxqfnczjalmn190.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

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

To increase the capacity to gather input from diverse groups of family members, the SPP/APR stakeholder engagement plan included a number of different steps, including 1) translating SPP Portal print resources into Spanish; 2) providing Spanish versions of the SPP Feedback Survey; 3) providing directions on how to add language captioning to online SPP indicator videos; and 4) providing a Spanish interpreter at SPP Family Forums. Additional translation services were available on request.

BEISFS and EITA staff monitored the SPP online feedback survey to ensure that comments were received from diverse groups of parents based on race, ethnicity, geographic region and role. Information on the demographics of those who had provided feedback were provided to key stakeholder groups on an ongoing basis. Summaries of family stakeholder events, family feedback, and demographics can be found at: https://tiu11.padlet.org/manketell1/zdxqfnczjalmn190.

Soliciting Public Input:

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

A broad, systemic plan for soliciting public input was developed and implemented to gather stakeholder input on the Infant Toddler EI indicators. All steps of the plan included an opportunity for stakeholders provide feedback on setting indicator targets, analyzing historic and current data, develop improvement strategies and evaluate indicator progress.

The first step in the plan was to convene an Executive Stakeholder Input Team. The ESI team was composed of the parent co-chair of the SICC, the professional co-chair of the SICC, the BEISFS Bureau Chief and Data Manager for the Infant Toddler EI program, Special Assistant to the Deputy Secretary for Family Engagement, BEISFS Early Intervention advisor and EITA project manager. The ESI team’s goal was to develop and monitor the process for stakeholder input. On at least a monthly basis from December 2020 to December 2021, the ESI team met or communicated through email about the progress in gathering stakeholder input.

The second step in the SPP stakeholder process was a Stakeholder Forum for members of all of BEISFS’s key advisory/stakeholder groups. Invitations to the Stakeholder Forum were sent to parent and professional members of SEAP, SICC, CSE, and members of advisory groups for children with low incidence disabilities. Each forum provided an overview of the APR Results indicators, reviewed current and historic data, and discussed proposed targets. Stakeholders were provided with small group opportunities to give feedback on the proposed targets and identify activities that would promote improvement on the indicator. Notes were taken on participant comments.

The third step in the SPP stakeholder process was a series of live Family Forums to gather input specifically from family members who currently have or in the past had a child in an Early Intervention program. Four Family Forums were held, two each on December 9 and 15, 2021. Day and evening sessions were held. The forum content was provided in a similar manner to the Stakeholder Forum and focused on family engagement indicators for Part B preschool (B\*8) and Part C (C4), Indicator B6 (Least Restrictive Environment), and Indicators C5 & C6 (Child Find). Family members were provided with small group opportunities to give feedback on the proposed targets and identify activities that would promote improvement on the indicator. Two of the Family Forums used a live Spanish interpreter.

Information on the Family Forums were disseminated through the SICC, SEAP, CSE, and Local Interagency Coordinating Councils (LICCs). Early Intervention leaders were encouraged to disseminate the information to families in their Early Intervention programs. Family Forum materials were also disseminated to parent organizations (PTIs) within Pennsylvania including the PEAL Center, Hune, Parents as Partners in Professional Development, and Competence and Confidence Partners in Policymaking EI.

The fourth step in the SPP stakeholder process was the development and dissemination of strategies for stakeholder organizations and individual stakeholders to provide individual and group feedback. A Discussion Guide was developed in both English and Spanish. It included steps that individual stakeholders could take to provide feedback. It also included information for stakeholder organizations who were interested in holding their own input forums. The information was disseminated statewide through leadership and parent meetings, at scheduled Stakeholder and Family Forums, and through email communication to stakeholder groups. It was reported that SPP feedback was gathered at LICC meetings, Early Intervention staff meetings, parent organizations, and provided to families in Early Intervention by staff. Feedback was gathered through an online survey which was available in both English and Spanish.

All of the steps in the stakeholder input process were supported through the development of an online SPP Portal (http://www.eita-pa.org/pa-spp-page/). The SPP Portal for was used as a central location for short videos describing each indicator, Discussion Guides (available in English and Spanish), links to online feedback forms, and other resources related to SPP stakeholder input. The SPP portal was used in announcements on how to give feedback. A link was provided on the SPP Portal that led to a Spanish description on the stakeholder feedback process.

In total, feedback was gathered from 207 Early Intervention stakeholders, including 47 parents.

Making Results Available to the Public:

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

A summary of the stakeholder process and results were presented to SEAP in January 2022 and the SICC in February 2022. The summary report will be disseminated to the public in spring 2022. All details of the results of the stakeholder feedback process, including meeting agendas, notes, stakeholder feedback summaries on proposed targets and SPP/APR activities, presentation materials, and demographics of participating stakeholders will be made available to the public in spring 2022.

Further details of the stakeholder feedback process can be found at https://tiu11.padlet.org/manketell1/zdxqfnczjalmn190.

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

The Committee of Stakeholder Engagement (CSE) was used to advise the Coaching Executive Team through a data-informed decision making process. CSE members include the parent and professional co-chairs of the State Interagency Coordinating Council, leaders from Infant Toddler and Preschool Early Intervention programs, administrators of local Early Intervention provider agencies, parent leaders, representatives from Institutes of Higher Education, and others. CSE has met quarterly since 2019 to review materials, provide input on selection of Early Intervention programs to begin participation, discuss training schedules, review fidelity measures, and to review progress data.

In Fall 2021, broad stakeholder input was gathered on the proposed changes to the SiMR and it’s targets. Input was gathered through an advisory committee forum and an online survey, available in both English and Spanish. The online survey provided an opportunity for local organizations and individuals to provide feedback without having to participate in a scheduled forum. The information about the process for providing feedback was disseminated statewide through leadership and parent meetings, at scheduled Stakeholder and Family Forums, and through email communication to stakeholder groups. It was reported that SPP feedback was gathered at LICC meetings, Early Intervention staff meetings, parent organizations, and provided to families in Early Intervention by staff.

Further details on the stakeholder process can be found in the introductory section of this APR. Summaries of family stakeholder events, family feedback, and demographics can be found at: https://tiu11.padlet.org/manketell1/zdxqfnczjalmn190.

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

NO

**Additional Implementation Activities**

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

All activities anticipated to be implemented in FFY 2021 can be found in the sections on next steps.

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

All activities anticipated to be implemented in FFY 2021 can be found in the sections on next steps.

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

Pennsylvania begin implementation of its new SiMR strategies in FFY 2020 and no barriers have been identified to date.

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

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 11 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

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

## 11 - Required Actions

# 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:**

Emily Hackleman

**Title:**

Part C Data Manager

**Email:**

ehackleman@pa.gov

**Phone:**

7177833636

**Submitted on:**

04/26/22 8:47:38 AM
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