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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. There are seven areas reviewed during the verification visit that cover the components of the Early Intervention program. In each of the seven areas, there are required indicators that 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 (BEIS/FS) staff, Early Intervention Technical Assistance (EITA) staff, and peer reviewers. The utilization of verification teams allows BEIS/FS 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 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. BEIS/FS staff continue to validate all areas of noncompliance identified during the verification visits are corrected within a year. Additional onsite visits from BEIS/FS staff may occur at the discretion of BEIS/FS if during the verification cycle there is a significant decrease in program performance or if individual or systemic concerns arise.   
  
  
Pennsylvania’s determination process uses data from sources such as the APR/SPP indicators, annual family survey, complaints, and quality of data entered into the statewide PELICAN-EI information system. 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 Quality Enhancement Plan to reflect improvement activities. The determination is also used to identify and provide differentiated levels of support to local programs. This allows the BEIS/FS to use resources in a more effective and efficient manner and have the greatest impact on program practices.   
  
Pennsylvania also uses a comprehensive data management system that enables the review of individual child data as well as statewide data. The data management system supports referral information, service coordination activities, planning information, financial management, quality measures and other reporting needs for the BEIS/FS. 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 BEIS/FS to ensure data driven decision making for quality improvement.   
  
Pennsylvania ensures that a complaint management process is implemented. BEIS/FS staff reviews 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 BEIS/FS advisor. The advisors serve as primary contacts 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. As a result of this involvement with local programs, each BEIS/FS advisor has ongoing contact with each of his/her 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 BEIS/FS staff, advisors and statewide management staff to be aware of program concerns and issues; 2) provides BEIS/FS 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 BEIS/FS, 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 BEIS/FS. 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 development of quality enhancement plans developed annually with each Infant Toddler and Preschool Early Intervention program. The Quality Enhancement Plan is based on findings from verification visits, the determination process, BEIS/FS priorities, relevant research, and locally identified needs. Quality Enhancement Planning is an ongoing process that is the result of conversations, data collection and review, research and clear identification of outcomes. The Quality Enhancement Plan focuses on specific programmatic changes or outcomes and includes information on how change will be measured. Quality enhancement plans 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 through EITA focuses on a model that supports the BEIS/FS in its management of the Early Intervention system to ensure skilled, highly qualified early intervention staff that result in high-quality services. The four core functions used to support the BEIS/FS include:   
• Verification Support - providing support to the BEIS/FS’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 Quality Enhancement Plans; and targeted, intensive support to select programs based on the results of the verification process or program management data analysis.   
• Policy Support - providing assistance to the BEIS/FS in development of policies to ensure high-quality EI services and assisting local programs in translating EI policies into practice. This is accomplished through:   
o technical assistance in developing BEIS/FS policy documents & reports;   
o development of statewide leadership activities; and   
o policy related research and materials development.   
• Support for professional development 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:   
o statewide and local workshops;   
o online learning modules and webinars; and   
o materials development and dissemination.  
• 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:   
o statewide and local training;   
o online learning modules and webinars; and   
o materials development and dissemination.   
  
To support the four core functions of EITA, the following strategies and business practices are utilized:   
• build partnerships with state and local EI leadership;   
• provide support to families by actively working to build family leaders; provide technical assistance that is informed by multiple forms of data;   
• use the most current learning technologies to effectively reach our audiences;   
• build partnerships with other Early Intervention and Early Childhood technical assistance agencies and organizations, such as connections to the school-age training and technical assistance network (PaTTAN);   
• evaluate both the long and short-term impact of our activities;   
• provide effective and efficient project management; and   
• provide solutions that are responsive to identified needs.

**Stakeholder Involvement:**

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

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). Both meetings meet face-to-face, but also use webinar connections so that stakeholders who are unable to travel to meetings can still participate in discussions and decision making. Using these two groups allows BEIS/FS 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.   
  
Membership in the SICC and CSE is composed of a parent as a co-chair, 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.   
  
The BEIS/FS convenes bi-monthly EI leadership meetings with administrators of local EI programs. In addition, leadership conferences are held twice annually (Policy Forum in spring, Leadership conference in fall).   
  
In December 2020, BEIS/FS and EITA staff met with both SEAP and the SICC to review annual APR data and to discuss potential targets for FFY 2020 APR indicators. During the presentation, staff led a discussion on the historical data and targets for each indicator. Current APR indicator data was presented and potential targets for each indicator were reviewed. SEAP and SICC members made recommendations for targets for each indicator. These recommendations were reviewed by BEIS/FS and this input was used to finalize FFY 2020 targets.

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

YES

**Reporting to the Public:**

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

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 BEIS/FS, 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 2018 data for each Infant Toddler Early Intervention program and will be updated to include the FFY 2019 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 complete copy of Pennsylvania's SPP/APR on each Infant Toddler Early Intervention program page.

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP’s coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State’s capacity to improve its SiMR data.

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

## Intro - OSEP Response

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

## Intro - Required Actions

# Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

**Instructions**

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

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

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

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 95.61% | 94.28% | 94.39% | 92.04% | 91.49% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner** | **Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 31,192 | 33,790 | 91.49% | 100% | 93.78% | 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.***

496

**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, 2019- June 30, 2020

**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. Analysis at a service level shows that 96% of all IFSP services were provided on time as defined by Pennsylvania state regulation.

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

In FFY 2019, Pennsylvania did not meet targets for Indicator 1, timeline delivery of early intervention services, although no slippage was noted. The FFY 2019 data showed that 2,044 infants and toddlers had services that were not delivered within 14 calendar days from the completed IFSP.   
  
Four Early Intervention programs showed percentages of timely service delivery below 90%. An additional 5 programs showed percentages of timely services between 90 – 95%. The 2 largest Early Intervention programs accounted for 61% of the children receiving late services. Twenty-two of the Early Intervention programs had less than 10 records with a late IFSP, and 10 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.   
  
The reliability and validity of FFY 2019 data for Indicator C1, the provision of timely IFSP services, has been impacted by COVID-19. Pennsylvania anticipates additional impact on data in FFY 2020-21 to be reported in February 2022 SPP/APR.   
  
Data analysis, including stakeholder group input from Infant Toddler Early Intervention program leaders has identified the following impacts due to COVID-19: difficulty in obtaining parental signatures and reported higher rates of cancelled or no-show service delivery appointments due to COVID-19 concerns which are causing delays in timelines.   
  
Delays in service provision may be masked by COVID-19. EI Program leaders are reporting increased number of service providers available for service delivery due to decreased numbers of new referrals during COVID and due to increases in service providers who are available to provide virtual EI services. Since EI service providers are no longer limited by geographic area, EI Program leaders increased requests for contracts/referrals from EI service providers who are outside the typical county area.   
  
To mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the C1 data reliability and validity, BEIS/FS has provided guidance on accepting digital signatures for parent consent and provided fiscal support for purchasing of online programs to capture digital signatures.   
  
In addition, local EI programs have implemented strategies to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the C1 data reliability and validity by committing more of Service Coordinators’ time to documenting signatures and outreach to families to remind them of appointments; organizing virtual use of interpreters; and developing local program guidance on contracting for virtual EI services and returning to in-person EI services.

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

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 39 | 39 | 0 | 0 |

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

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

In order to verify that the local Early Intervention programs with identified instances of noncompliance are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for the provision of timely IFSP services, BEIS/FS Advisors review a sample of child records from that EI program. The records may be reviewed either through the PELICAN-EI data system or onsite child record review. BEIS/FS Advisors review the start date of IFSP services and any reason for a delay in meeting this timeline in order to determine that the local EI program is now correctly implementing the regulatory requirement for timely services.   
  
In addition to a review of child records, local Early Intervention programs are required to submit a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), which is approved by BEIS/FS, to address correction of all areas of noncompliance. Implementation of the QEP must be validated within one year of issuance of the findings report. BEIS/FS Advisors review documentation of completion of any QEP activities as part of the validation of correction of systemic noncompliance. Documentation may include reviewing updated local policies and procedures, documentation of staff training on new procedures, or observations of service delivery as appropriate.   
  
BEIS/FS has verified that all local Early Intervention programs who had identified noncompliance in FFY 2018 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, BEIS/FS Advisors reviewed the record of the identified child, either through the PELICAN-EI data system or onsite record review, to verify that the child received the services listed on his/her IFSP, although late. BEIS/FS has verified that all local Early Intervention programs with individual cases of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 2018**

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

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

## 1 - Required Actions

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

# Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target>= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Data | 99.85% | 99.96% | 99.19% | 99.87% | 99.91% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target>= | 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). Both meetings meet face-to-face, but also use webinar connections so that stakeholders who are unable to travel to meetings can still participate in discussions and decision making. Using these two groups allows BEIS/FS 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.   
  
Membership in the SICC and CSE is composed of a parent as a co-chair, 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.   
  
The BEIS/FS convenes bi-monthly EI leadership meetings with administrators of local EI programs. In addition, leadership conferences are held twice annually (Policy Forum in spring, Leadership conference in fall).   
  
In December 2020, BEIS/FS and EITA staff met with both SEAP and the SICC to review annual APR data and to discuss potential targets for FFY 2020 APR indicators. During the presentation, staff led a discussion on the historical data and targets for each indicator. Current APR indicator data was presented and potential targets for each indicator were reviewed. SEAP and SICC members made recommendations for targets for each indicator. These recommendations were reviewed by BEIS/FS and this input was used to finalize FFY 2020 targets.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/08/2020 | Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings | 23,806 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/08/2020 | Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs | 23,827 |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings** | **Total number of Infants and toddlers with IFSPs** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 23,806 | 23,827 | 99.91% | 95.00% | 99.91% | Met Target | No Slippage |

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

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

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

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Outcomes:

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

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

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:**

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

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

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2:**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 3 - Indicator Data

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

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

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). Both meetings meet face-to-face, but also use webinar connections so that stakeholders who are unable to travel to meetings can still participate in discussions and decision making. Using these two groups allows BEIS/FS 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.   
  
Membership in the SICC and CSE is composed of a parent as a co-chair, 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.   
  
The BEIS/FS convenes bi-monthly EI leadership meetings with administrators of local EI programs. In addition, leadership conferences are held twice annually (Policy Forum in spring, Leadership conference in fall).   
  
In December 2020, BEIS/FS and EITA staff met with both SEAP and the SICC to review annual APR data and to discuss potential targets for FFY 2020 APR indicators. During the presentation, staff led a discussion on the historical data and targets for each indicator. Current APR indicator data was presented and potential targets for each indicator were reviewed. SEAP and SICC members made recommendations for targets for each indicator. These recommendations were reviewed by BEIS/FS and this input was used to finalize FFY 2020 targets.

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A1** | 2009 | Target>= | 73.13% | 73.13% | 73.13% | 73.13% | 74.13% |
| **A1** | 53.54% | Data | 72.21% | 71.24% | 68.29% | 68.42% | 67.85% |
| **A2** | 2009 | Target>= | 64.80% | 65.80% | 66.80% | 67.80% | 68.80% |
| **A2** | 67.43% | Data | 60.38% | 58.95% | 58.62% | 58.64% | 58.45% |
| **B1** | 2009 | Target>= | 80.51% | 80.51% | 80.51% | 80.51% | 81.51% |
| **B1** | 69.90% | Data | 78.19% | 77.85% | 75.61% | 76.25% | 75.14% |
| **B2** | 2009 | Target>= | 53.67% | 53.67% | 53.67% | 53.67% | 54.67% |
| **B2** | 54.41% | Data | 51.21% | 51.05% | 50.31% | 49.93% | 49.28% |
| **C1** | 2009 | Target>= | 80.56% | 80.56% | 80.56% | 80.56% | 81.56% |
| **C1** | 62.65% | Data | 78.03% | 77.98% | 75.64% | 75.76% | 74.92% |
| **C2** | 2009 | Target>= | 60.73% | 60.73% | 60.73% | 60.73% | 61.73% |
| **C2** | 60.15% | Data | 58.51% | 57.62% | 57.57% | 58.28% | 57.14% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A1>= | 74.13% |
| Target A2>= | 68.80% |
| Target B1>= | 81.51% |
| Target B2>= | 54.67% |
| Target C1>= | 81.56% |
| Target C2>= | 61.73% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

14,697

**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 | 80 | 0.55% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 3,263 | 22.30% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 2,893 | 19.77% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 4,273 | 29.20% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 4,126 | 28.19% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 7,166 | 10,509 | 67.85% | 74.13% | 68.19% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 8,399 | 14,635 | 58.45% | 68.80% | 57.39% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable**

In FFY 2019, Pennsylvania did not meet the child outcome targets for Indicator C3 and showed slippage for data element A2; the percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in the area of positive social-emotional skills.   
  
Further analysis of the child outcome data, both with state-level and local data, was conducted to determine if there were any patterns that indicated concerns related to data quality or lack of child progress. Analysis did not identify any patterns related to decreased child progress based on demographic groups. The slippage in Indicator C3, data element A2 has been impacted by COVID-19. Please see the details on the COVID-19 impact in the Additional Information section below.   
  
Thirteen out of the 48 Infant Toddler Early Intervention programs (27%), did not meet the criteria of submitting entry and exit data pairs on at least 65% of the children who exited after a minimum of 6 months of service. This is an increase of 15% from FFY 2018. Of those programs who did not reach exit pairs criteria, 62% of the programs also were below average on data element A2.   
  
Because the Indicator C3 and child outcome pairs are part of Pennsylvania’s state determination process, advisors with BEIS/FS provided targeted technical assistance to the local programs who were identified as low performers on this indicator.

**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 | 78 | 0.53% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 3,118 | 21.28% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 4,416 | 30.14% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 4,921 | 33.58% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 2,120 | 14.47% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 9,337 | 12,533 | 75.14% | 81.51% | 74.50% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 7,041 | 14,653 | 49.28% | 54.67% | 48.05% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable**

In FFY 2019, Pennsylvania did not meet the child outcome targets for Indicator C3 and showed slippage for data element A2; the percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in the area of positive social-emotional skills.   
  
Further analysis of the child outcome data, both with state-level and local data, was conducted to determine if there were any patterns that indicated concerns related to data quality or lack of child progress. Analysis did not identify any patterns related to decreased child progress based on demographic groups. The slippage in Indicator C3, data element A2 has been impacted by COVID-19. Please see the details on the COVID-19 impact in the Additional Information section below.   
  
Thirteen out of the 48 Infant Toddler Early Intervention programs (27%), did not meet the criteria of submitting entry and exit data pairs on at least 65% of the children who exited after a minimum of 6 months of service. This is an increase of 15% from FFY 2018. Of those programs who did not reach exit pairs criteria, 62% of the programs also were below average on data element A2.   
  
Because the Indicator C3 and child outcome pairs are part of Pennsylvania’s state determination process, advisors with BEIS/FS provided targeted technical assistance to the local programs who were identified as low performers on this indicator.

**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 | 72 | 0.49% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 2,986 | 20.40% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 3,428 | 23.42% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 5,525 | 37.75% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 2,625 | 17.94% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 8,953 | 12,011 | 74.92% | 81.56% | 74.54% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 8,150 | 14,636 | 57.14% | 61.73% | 55.68% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

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

In FFY 2019, Pennsylvania did not meet the child outcome targets for Indicator C3 and showed slippage for data element C2; the percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in the area of the use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.  
  
Further analysis of the child outcome data, both with state-level and local data, was conducted to determine if there were any patterns that indicated concerns related to data quality or lack of child progress. Analysis did not identify any patterns related to decreased child progress based on demographic groups. The slippage in Indicator C3, data element C2 has been impacted by COVID-19. Please see the details on the COVID-19 impact in the Additional Information section below.   
  
Thirteen out of the 48 Infant Toddler Early Intervention programs (27%), did not meet the criteria of submitting entry and exit data pairs on at least 65% of the children who exited after a minimum of 6 months of service. This is an increase of 15% from FFY 2018. Of those programs who did not reach exit pairs criteria, 85% of the programs also were below average on data element C2.   
  
Because the Indicator C3 and child outcome pairs are part of Pennsylvania’s state determination process, advisors with BEIS/FS provided targeted technical assistance to the local programs who were identified as low performers on this indicator.

**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 | 21,949 |
| 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. | 5,970 |

| **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 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)**

The reliability and completeness of FFY 2019 data for Indicator C3, child outcome data, has been impacted by COVID-19. Pennsylvania anticipates additional impact on data in FFY 2020-21 to be reported in February 2022 SPP/APR.   
  
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. Early Intervention program leaders have also reported difficulty in gathering child outcome data for infants and toddlers who, while still active in the EI program, did not receive services at parent request due to COVID-19, in the 60 days prior to the child’s exit from the EI program.   
  
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, BEIS/FS has provided guidance on the collection of child outcome data during COVID-19.

## 3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3 - OSEP Response

The State reported that the COVID-19 pandemic impacted the data for this indicator. Specifically, the State reported, "[t]he 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, BEIS/FS has provided guidance on the collection of child outcome data during COVID-19."

## 3 - Required Actions

# Indicator 4: Family Involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

A. Know their rights;

B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and

C. Help their children develop and learn.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 4 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2006 | Target>= | 87.00% | 87.00% | 88.00% | 89.00% | 90.00% |
| A | 67.00% | Data | 88.21% | 88.36% | 90.34% | 89.12% | 87.08% |
| B | 2006 | Target>= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| B | 63.00% | Data | 94.36% | 94.89% | 95.99% | 95.00% | 94.12% |
| C | 2006 | Target>= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| C | 78.00% | Data | 95.19% | 95.16% | 95.93% | 95.85% | 94.17% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A>= | 87.08% |
| Target B>= | 94.12% |
| Target C>= | 94.17% |

**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). Both meetings meet face-to-face, but also use webinar connections so that stakeholders who are unable to travel to meetings can still participate in discussions and decision making. Using these two groups allows BEIS/FS 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.   
  
Membership in the SICC and CSE is composed of a parent as a co-chair, 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.   
  
The BEIS/FS convenes bi-monthly EI leadership meetings with administrators of local EI programs. In addition, leadership conferences are held twice annually (Policy Forum in spring, Leadership conference in fall).   
  
In December 2020, BEIS/FS and EITA staff met with both SEAP and the SICC to review annual APR data and to discuss potential targets for FFY 2020 APR indicators. During the presentation, staff led a discussion on the historical data and targets for each indicator. Current APR indicator data was presented and potential targets for each indicator were reviewed. SEAP and SICC members made recommendations for targets for each indicator. These recommendations were reviewed by BEIS/FS and this input was used to finalize FFY 2020 targets.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The number of families to whom surveys were distributed | 23,476 |
| Number of respondent families participating in Part C | 5,922 |
| A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 5,476 |
| A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 5,683 |
| 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 | 5,481 |
| B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | 5,649 |
| 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 | 5,849 |
| C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn | 5,878 |

| **Measure** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2) | 87.08% | 87.08% | 96.36% | 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) | 94.12% | 94.12% | 97.03% | 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) | 94.17% | 94.17% | 99.51% | 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 families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program. | NO |

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

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 will monitor the respondent demographics throughout the survey time period. Monthly reports of survey demographics will be provided to local Early Intervention programs. This data will allow the local Early Intervention programs to monitor survey returns in their area and provide targeted support to families who have not yet returned surveys.

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

BEIS/FS analyzed survey responses at the mid-point of the return period to determine areas of low response rate and under representation in race/ethnicity categories. The data on survey responses was provided to local Early Intervention programs to assist them in providing target efforts to increase response rates.   
  
Using the +/-3% tolerance level established by the Response Calculator developed by the National Post School Outcome Center (NPSO), the Multiracial respondent group was under-represented by 4.65%. The Hispanic respondent category was over-represented by 3.48%. All other race/ethnicity categories were within tolerance levels.

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

Pennsylvania’s methodology for dissemination of the family survey in FFY 2019 differed than in previous years. However, the questions to generate APR data did not change.   
  
In FFY 2019, dissemination of the survey was conducted through local EI programs. Local EI programs were provided with dissemination materials including a printable post card/flyer, and information to use in social media postings. The dissemination materials included links for both the English and Spanish online versions of the survey. The CONNECT Information Line was used for translation to other languages. Training webinars were held in January 2020 to provide local Early Intervention programs with strategies to use in order to increase return rates. In addition, monthly reports of return rates were sent to local Early Intervention programs to assist programs in monitoring their return rate data on an ongoing basis.

## 4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

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

## 4 - OSEP Response

## 4 - Required Actions

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.

# Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 2.10% | 2.10% | 2.20% | 2.20% | 2.20% |
| Data | 2.10% | 2.21% | 2.50% | 2.64% | 2.70% |

**Targets**

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

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). Both meetings meet face-to-face, but also use webinar connections so that stakeholders who are unable to travel to meetings can still participate in discussions and decision making. Using these two groups allows BEIS/FS 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.   
  
Membership in the SICC and CSE is composed of a parent as a co-chair, 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.   
  
The BEIS/FS convenes bi-monthly EI leadership meetings with administrators of local EI programs. In addition, leadership conferences are held twice annually (Policy Forum in spring, Leadership conference in fall).   
  
In December 2020, BEIS/FS and EITA staff met with both SEAP and the SICC to review annual APR data and to discuss potential targets for FFY 2020 APR indicators. During the presentation, staff led a discussion on the historical data and targets for each indicator. Current APR indicator data was presented and potential targets for each indicator were reviewed. SEAP and SICC members made recommendations for targets for each indicator. These recommendations were reviewed by BEIS/FS and this input was used to finalize FFY 2020 targets.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/08/2020 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs | 3,754 |
| Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin | 06/25/2020 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 | 134,712 |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs** | **Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3,754 | 134,712 | 2.70% | 2.70% | 2.79% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Compare your results to the national data**

Pennsylvania’s Part C program has shown increased rates of identification of eligible infants under the age of one since FFY 2009. Pennsylvania has also met or exceeded its targets for this indicator in 11 out of the last 14 years.   
  
For FFY 2019, Pennsylvania identified 2.79% of infants under the age of 1 as being eligible for the Early Intervention program; an increase of 0.09% from the previous year. As reported by the the Infant and Toddler Coordinators Association’s (ITCA) analysis of child count data (FFY 2018 single day count), the national average of infants under age 1 year identified as eligible for the Part C program is 1.25%. Pennsylvania’s state average is well above the national average. Pennsylvania’s Pennsylvania’s state average was the 6th highest percentage of infants under age 1 served in the nation. Pennsylvania predicts that the FFY 2019 child find data for infants under the age of one year will continue to be one of the highest percentages in the nation

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

The reliability, validity, and completeness of FFY 2019 data for Indicator C5 has been impacted by COVID-19. Pennsylvania anticipates additional impact on data in FFY 2020-21 to be reported in February 2022 SPP/APR.   
  
During the 4 month period from March to June 2020, there was a significant decrease in the number of referrals to the Infant Toddler EI program as compared to the previous year. The average number of children referred each month from March to June 2019 was 3,284 but only 2,027 in March to June 2020. While some recovery in the number of children referred was seen in at the end of 2020, numbers remain significantly below 2019 referral rates. The average number of children referred each month from September to November 2020 was 2,308, an increase of 281 children from the March to June 2020 time period, but still below the average monthly referrals from September to November 2019 (N=3,149).   
  
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).   
  
To mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the C5 data reliability, validity and completeness, BEIS/FS developed and disseminated 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

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

## 6 - Indicator Data

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 4.41% | 4.41% | 4.41% | 4.50% | 4.50% |
| Data | 4.36% | 4.40% | 4.86% | 5.00% | 5.35% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 5.35% |

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). Both meetings meet face-to-face, but also use webinar connections so that stakeholders who are unable to travel to meetings can still participate in discussions and decision making. Using these two groups allows BEIS/FS 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.   
  
Membership in the SICC and CSE is composed of a parent as a co-chair, 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.   
  
The BEIS/FS convenes bi-monthly EI leadership meetings with administrators of local EI programs. In addition, leadership conferences are held twice annually (Policy Forum in spring, Leadership conference in fall).   
  
In December 2020, BEIS/FS and EITA staff met with both SEAP and the SICC to review annual APR data and to discuss potential targets for FFY 2020 APR indicators. During the presentation, staff led a discussion on the historical data and targets for each indicator. Current APR indicator data was presented and potential targets for each indicator were reviewed. SEAP and SICC members made recommendations for targets for each indicator. These recommendations were reviewed by BEIS/FS and this input was used to finalize FFY 2020 targets.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/08/2020 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs | 23,827 |
| Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin | 06/25/2020 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 | 411,667 |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs** | **Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 23,827 | 411,667 | 5.35% | 5.35% | 5.79% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Compare your results to the national data**

Pennsylvania’s Part C program has shown increased rates of identification of eligible infants and toddlers under the age of three since FFY 2009. Pennsylvania has also met or exceeded its targets for this indicator in 10 out of the last 13 years.   
  
For FFY 2019, Pennsylvania identified 5.79% of infants and toddlers under the age 3 as being eligible for the Early Intervention program; an increase of 0.44% from the previous year. As reported by the the Infant and Toddler Coordinators Association’s (ITCA) analysis of child count data (FFY 2018 single day count), the national average of infants under age 3 identified as eligible for the Part C program is 3.48%. Pennsylvania’s state average is well above the national average. Pennsylvania’s state average was the 8th highest percentage of infants and toddlers under age 3 years served in the nation.

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

The reliability, validity, and completeness of FFY 2019 data for Indicator C6 has been impacted by COVID-19. Pennsylvania anticipates additional impact on data in FFY 2020-21 to be reported in February 2022 SPP/APR.   
  
During the 4 month period from March to June 2020, there was a significant decrease in the number of referrals to the Infant Toddler EI program as compared to the previous year. The average number of children referred each month from March to June 2019 was 3,284 but only 2,027 in March to June 2020. While some recovery in the number of children referred was seen in at the end of 2020, numbers remain significantly below 2019 referral rates. The average number of children referred each month from September to November 2020 was 2,308, an increase of 281 children from the March to June 2020 time period, but still below the average monthly referrals from September to November 2019 (N=3,149).   
  
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).   
  
To mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the C6 data reliability, validity and completeness, BEIS/FS developed and disseminated 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 C6 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

## 6 - Required Actions

# Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

**Instructions**

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

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

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 98.94% | 99.07% | 98.86% | 97.51% | 98.58% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline** | **Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 16,892 | 21,511 | 98.58% | 100% | 97.68% | 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.**

4,120

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

State database

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

July 1, 2019 - June 30, 2020

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

This data 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)**

The reliability and validity of FFY 2019 data for Indicator C7 on the number of infants and toddlers for whom and initial evaluation and IFSP meeting were conducted within 45-days was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Pennsylvania anticipates additional impact on data in FFY 2020-21 to be reported in February 2022 SPP/APR.   
  
Data analysis, including stakeholder group input from Infant Toddler Early Intervention program leaders has identified the following impacts due to COVID-19: difficulty in obtaining parental signatures, delays in evaluations due to the change from in-person to virtual, and delays in evaluations due to the need to purchase and train staff on evaluation tools that can be used in virtual settings. Early Intervention programs are reporting higher rates of cancelled or no-show evaluation appointments and IFSP meetings due to COVID-19 concerns which are causing delays in meeting the 45-day timeline. Some Early Intervention programs are reporting an increase in the number of children found eligible using Informed Clinical Opinion due to difficulties with virtual evaluations.   
  
To mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the C7 data reliability and validity, BEIS/FS has 1) provided guidance on accepting digital signatures for parent consent; 2) provided fiscal support for purchasing of online programs to capture digital signatures; 3) provided guidance on conducting evaluations through virtual practices; 3) provided professional development on strategies for virtual evaluations and tools that are appropriate for virtual evaluations; and 4) supported the purchase of evaluation tools appropriate for virtual use.   
  
In addition, local EI programs have implemented strategies to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the C7 data reliability and validity by purchasing and training staff on evaluation tools that can be used virtually; committing more of Service Coordinators time to documenting signatures and outreach to families to remind them of appointments; organizing virtual use of interpreters; and ensuring a shared, positive message about the effectiveness of Early Intervention services provided through tele-intervention.

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

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 24 | 24 | 0 | 0 |

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

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

In order to verify that the local Early Intervention programs with identified instances of noncompliance are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for the 45-day timeline for the provision of initial evaluation, assessment and IFSP, BEIS/FS Advisors review a sample of child records from that EI program. The records may be reviewed either through the PELICAN-EI data system or onsite child record review. BEIS/FS Advisors review the referral date, the evaluation date, and the IFSP date, and any reason for a delay in meeting this timeline in order to determine that the local EI program is now correctly implementing the regulatory requirement for 45 timeline.   
  
In addition to a review of child records, local Early Intervention programs are required to submit a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), which is approved by BEIS/FS, to address correction of all areas of noncompliance. Implementation of the QEP must be validated within one year of issuance of the findings report. BEIS/FS Advisors review documentation of completion of any QEP activities as part of the validation of correction of systemic noncompliance. Documentation may include reviewing updated local policies and procedures, documentation of staff training on new procedures, or observations of service delivery as appropriate.   
  
BEIS/FS has verified that all local Early Intervention programs who had identified noncompliance in FFY 2018 are correctly implementing regulatory requirements related to meeting the 45-day timeline for initial evaluations, assessments, and IFSPs, 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, BEIS/FS Advisors reviewed the record of the identified child, either through the PELICAN-EI data system or onsite record review, to verify that the child received an initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP if eligible, although late. BEIS/FS has verified that all local Early Intervention programs with individual cases of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 have provided initial evaluations, assessments, and IFSPs if eligible, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the Early Intervention program.

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

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

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

## 7 - Required Actions

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

# Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

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

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 8A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 98.30% | 98.33% | 98.69% | 98.01% | 97.72% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

NO

**If no, please explain.**

The exits reported for 8A (11,565) 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10,878 | 11,565 | 97.72% | 100% | 97.88% | 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.**

442

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

State database

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

July 1, 2019 - June 30, 2020

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

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)**

In FFY 2018, Pennsylvania did not meet targets for Indicator 8A, the number of toddlers who had a timely transition plan, although no slippage was noted. The FFY 2018 data showed that 2.12% toddlers had transition plans developed beyond the Part C requirements.   
  
All Early Intervention programs had percentages of timely transition plans over 95% with the exception of one program at 92%. The largest Early Intervention program in Pennsylvania accounted for 50.61% of all late transition plans. Five Early Intervention programs had between 10 – 20 late transition plans, 23 Early Intervention programs had less than 5 late transition plans, and 19 programs had did not have any late transition plans.   
  
The programs with the most delays in transition plan development are in the Southeast part of the state. The Southeast region of Pennsylvania was particularly impacted by COVID-19 with early health related restrictions and higher incidence of infections. These issues and reduced access to technology in order to hold virtual meetings, led to delays in transition planning. Additional reasons for delays were attributed to scheduling problems and weather emergencies.   
  
The reliability and validity of FFY 2019 data for Indicator C8a, on the number of infants and toddlers for whom timely transition planning occurred, was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Pennsylvania anticipates additional impact on data in FFY 2020-21 to be reported in February 2022 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 and reported higher rates of cancelled or no-show appointments to COVID-19 concerns which are causing delays in meeting timelines. 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 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 40 | 40 | 0 | 0 |

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

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

In order to verify that the local Early Intervention programs with identified instances of noncompliance are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for the provision of timely transition plans, BEIS/FS Advisors review a sample of child records from that EI program. The records may be reviewed either through the PELICAN-EI data system or onsite child record review. BEIS/FS Advisors review the date of the transition plan and any reason for a delay in meeting this timeline in order to determine that the local EI program is now correctly implementing the regulatory requirement for timely transition plans.   
  
In addition to a review of child records, local Early Intervention programs are required to submit a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), which is approved by BEIS/FS, to address correction of all areas of noncompliance. Implementation of the QEP must be validated within one year of issuance of the findings report. BEIS/FS Advisors review documentation of completion of any QEP activities as part of the validation of correction of systemic noncompliance. Documentation may include reviewing updated local policies and procedures, documentation of staff training on new procedures, or observations of service delivery as appropriate.   
  
BEIS/FS has verified that all local Early Intervention programs who had identified noncompliance in FFY 2018 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, BEIS/FS Advisors reviewed the record of the identified child, either through the PELICAN-EI data system or onsite record review, to verify that the child received a transition plan, although late. BEIS/FS has verified that all local Early Intervention programs with individual cases of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 have developed transition plans, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the Early Intervention program.

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

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

## 8A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8A - OSEP Response

## 8A - Required Actions

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

# Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

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

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 8B - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

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

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

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

| **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 21,949 | 21,949 | 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

**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, 2019 - June 30, 2020

**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 2018**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

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

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 8C - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 98.24% | 98.38% | 98.45% | 98.24% | 97.99% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

NO

**If no, please explain.**

The number of exits reported for 8C (11,565) 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8,842 | 11,565 | 97.99% | 100% | 96.36% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

In FFY 2019, Pennsylvania did not meet the targets for Indicator C8c and showed slippage from FFY 2018 data. Further analysis of the child outcome data, both with state-level and local data, was conducted to determine the cause for the slippage.   
  
Analysis showed that while 32 programs had at least one instance of an untimely transition meeting, 81% of those programs had timely transition meetings rates between 95 – 99%. Twelve percent of the programs had timely transition meeting rates between 90 – 94%, and only two Early Intervention programs had timely transition meeting rates below 90%. One Early Intervention program was responsible for 68% of the late meetings.   
  
Advisors with BEIS/FS provided differentiated technical assistance to local Early Intervention programs who did not meet targets. Additional technical assistance activities were focused on the one program that accounted for a majority of the late transition meetings. Technical assistance activities included: notification in writing to the program administrator of the poor performance concerns; monthly review of the child outcome data by BEIS/FS staff; local analysis of transition data to identify specific areas of concern and develop an action plan with data-based targets for correction of poor performance; revision to procedures for monitoring; and verification of the implementation of new procedures.

**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.**

358

**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.**

1,957

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

State database

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

July 1, 2019 - June 30, 2020

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

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 2019 data for Indicator C8c, on the number of infants and toddlers for whom a timely transition meeting occurred, was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Pennsylvania anticipates additional impact on data in FFY 2020-21 to be reported in February 2022 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 and reported higher rates of cancelled or no-show appointments to COVID-19 concerns which are causing delays in meeting timelines. 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 C8c 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 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 33 | 33 | 0 | 0 |

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

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

In order to verify that the local Early Intervention programs with identified instances of noncompliance are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for the provision of timely transition conferences, BEIS/FS Advisors review a sample of child records from that EI program. The records may be reviewed either through the PELICAN-EI data system or onsite child record review. BEIS/FS Advisors review the date of the transition conference and any reason for a delay in meeting this timeline in order to determine that the local EI program is now correctly implementing the regulatory requirement for timely transition conferences.   
  
In addition to a review of child records, local Early Intervention programs are required to submit a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), which is approved by BEIS/FS, to address correction of all areas of noncompliance. Implementation of the QEP must be validated within one year of issuance of the findings report. BEIS/FS Advisors review documentation of completion of any QEP activities as part of the validation of correction of systemic noncompliance. Documentation may include reviewing updated local policies and procedures, documentation of staff training on new procedures, or observations of service delivery as appropriate.   
  
BEIS/FS has verified that all local Early Intervention programs who had identified noncompliance in FFY 2018 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, BEIS/FS Advisors reviewed the record of the identified child, either through the PELICAN-EI data system or onsite record review, to verify that the child received a transition conference, although late. BEIS/FS has verified that all local Early Intervention programs with individual cases of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 held transition conferences, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the Early Intervention program.

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

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

## 8C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8C - OSEP Response

## 8C - Required Actions

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

# Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

YES

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

## 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 EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

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

NO

**Prepopulated Data**

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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). Both meetings meet face-to-face, but also use webinar connections so that stakeholders who are unable to travel to meetings can still participate in discussions and decision making. Using these two groups allows BEIS/FS 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.   
  
Membership in the SICC and CSE is composed of a parent as a co-chair, 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.   
  
The BEIS/FS convenes bi-monthly EI leadership meetings with administrators of local EI programs. In addition, leadership conferences are held twice annually (Policy Forum in spring, Leadership conference in fall).   
  
In December 2020, BEIS/FS and EITA staff met with both SEAP and the SICC to review annual APR data and to discuss potential targets for FFY 2020 APR indicators. During the presentation, staff led a discussion on the historical data and targets for each indicator. Current APR indicator data was presented and potential targets for each indicator were reviewed. SEAP and SICC members made recommendations for targets for each indicator. These recommendations were reviewed by BEIS/FS and this input was used to finalize FFY 2020 targets.

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target>= |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data | 50.00% |  |  | 100.00% |  |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

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

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

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

## 10 - Required Actions

# Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan



# Certification

**Instructions**

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

**Certify**

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

**Select the certifier’s role**

Lead Agency Director

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

**Name:**

Lisa Parker

**Title:**

Part C Coordinator

**Email:**

liparker@pa.gov

**Phone:**

717-214-7130

**Submitted on:**

04/22/21 10:19:28 AM

# ED Attachments

  