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# Introduction

**Instructions**

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

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

The Puerto Rico Early Intervention Program (PREIP) – Avanzando Juntos resides within the Maternal, Child and Adolescent Health Division of the Department of Health. The State Office Team is comprised of the Part C Coordinator, a Program Evaluator, Data Manager, Child Development Consultant, and a new Operations Coordinator. There are seven regional programs led by regional supervisors in which early intervention services are provided island-wide. The Program’s technical assistance system is led by the Child Development Consultant who also works closely with the Supervision and Monitoring Unit (SMU). TA activities are coordinated based on collected data and needs identified through monitoring activities. Direct consultations with the service providers and discussions in monthly meetings with the regional supervisors are also methods to identify areas for technical assistance. Information from the TA Centers is also used, distributed, and discussed to ensure the timely delivery of high-quality services, and provide support to our regional programs. As required, the PREIP has a professional development system, also led by the Child Development Consultant. For this component, the UPR UCEDD is our academic/scientific partner and collaborates as requested by the Program. Regular meetings are scheduled with the SICC, in which the PREIP State Office Team discusses important information to design strategies for the improvement of the system’s capacity for the implementation of the evidence-based practice chosen by PR, other brad activities, and child outcomes. Part of the discussions regarding targets for FFY 2020-FFY 2025 was held during FFY 2021-2022 including a new baseline for indicator 5 and targets for indicator 6 in the 2022 SPP/APR clarification period. The SICC is the group that brings together the most important EIP stakeholders after a thorough data analysis carried out by the SMU. Currently, the Program shares important information with stakeholders and the general community by the means of the webpage of the Department of Health. The PR EIP will appoint new parent members for the SICC in FFY 2022.   
  
The COVID-19 pandemic has impacted the jurisdiction in various ways. For example, the provider shortage that the Program has noted as a need before has worsened and continues to be a challenge during FFY 2021. During the pandemic, the Program has seen a reduction in the number of providers, although it has also seen a decrease in the child count when compared to the year 2019. This was due to a decrease in referrals as a consequence of the lockdown. During FFY 2021, the PREIP experienced an increase in the number of referrals and child count data, while still struggling to identify, hire and retain personnel through the corporations/entities that have active contracts with the DoH to provide early intervention services. The state office team held multiple meetings with these corporations in FFY 2021 to identify barriers to controlling personnel turnover. Also, the Program has started the process to hire new service providers. Nevertheless, a definitive solution has not been identified, therefore personnel shortages persist.  
  
Despite the challenges, the PREIP had its achievements. First, 100% of COSF data was collected, indicator 3 targets are met and there were no slippages. Also, the program met the targets on indicators 2, 5, 6, 7, 8A, and 8C. Although indicator 4 targets were not met, there was no slippage since family outcomes have improved. Indicator 8B has always been a challenge for PR, but the program continues to improve in this area. It is expected to continue improving and meet the 100% target when a new module for indicators C8 and B12 is created by the PR Department of Education to help collect these data and also improve its quality.  
  
Regional personnel and service providers actively continued to support families through these difficult times and proved genuine adaptation capacities when the Program had to shift to virtual services only. As stated in FFY 2019, this was done in a short amount of time while in lockdown to guarantee the provision of services. Currently, EI services are provided both virtually and in person, depending on the modality the family prefers. Nevertheless, child-find strategies have started to be implemented to strengthen this component.   
  
Puerto Rico also met the target for its SiMR. Targets for the SiMR were discussed with the SICC after the SMU presented relevant data to help make an appropriate decision. Also, the system’s capacity for implementing infrastructure activities and evidence-based practices, and progress toward the SiMR, was fundamental in these discussions. The SICC and the PREIP decided that the jurisdiction needed to maintain its focus area to continue implementing activities that lead to an improvement in child outcomes, specifically our SiMR.   
  
Broad activities regarding the three strands of action selected for the SSIP have been conducted in FFY 2021. Training sessions for the implementation of the new eligibility and assessment tool were conducted. Also, conversations with the Programmatic Management Unit of the DoH have started for a collaboration to conduct the process and outcomes evaluation for this activity. The PREIP has strengthened its relationship with the PTIC which will result in more collaboration for the family engagement strand. Conversations with the PR Family-to-Family Center have started to conduct activities for this strand of action. New parent members are expected to be appointed in the SICC in FFY 2022.   
  
In FFY 2021, the program started receiving technical assistance for the development of a request for proposals for a new data system. The PREIP also received important technical assistance regarding data and personnel shortages. It is expected that FFY 2022 and FFY 2023 will see the completion of these important projects for the PREIP.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

The PREIP State Team has strong measures for data collection and reporting. The Program Evaluator and Data Manager ensure the required data are collected through various means and are valid and reliable. However, the jurisdiction still relies on a data system that is not centralized or updated, therefore the Supervision and Monitoring Unit still creates Excel sheets that are used to collect new data when needed. Child Count, referral by source, transitions, and COS data are still reported by the regional programs to the state office team using these Excel sheets. The PREIP identified the need of having a new data system that will allow the jurisdiction to continue collecting high-quality data more efficiently. APR funds will be used to finance this project. Implementation of the new data system is expected in FFY 2022.

**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.**

The Puerto Rico Early Intervention Program – Avanzando Juntos has a single line of authority for general administration and supervision, the identification and coordination of resources, the development of procedures to ensure the timely provision of services, for conducting monitoring activities and the overall implementation of the minimum components required under IDEA Part C. The lead agency for PREIP is the Department of Health (PRDoH). The Program is located under the Maternal, Child, and Adolescent Health Division and has seven regional offices island-wide within the seven health regions that comprise the Department. The PREIP State Office includes the Part C Coordinator, a new Operations Coordinator, the Program Evaluator, the Data Manager, and a Child Development Consultant. The Part C Coordinator is responsible for overseeing all the program’s activities to ensure that early intervention services are being provided—as required by the regulations—to infants and toddlers with developmental delays that are determined eligible. The accountability of the Program and the identification of resources are also the Coordinator’s responsibilities. Having memorandums of understanding (MOUs) with other programs and agencies is also under the Coordinator's responsibilities. The Operations Coordinator is the newest member of the State Office Team and has the responsibility of assisting the Part C Coordinator in the work related to the day-to-day operations of the regional programs. This means assisting the state team on the design, planning, and implementation of strategies and activities to improve child outcomes focusing on primarily supporting regional teams. The Program Evaluator designs and implements data collection methods and leads the monitoring and evaluation activities conducted in all regional programs. The Data Manager works alongside the Evaluator, collecting data from those regional programs and ensuring that these are precise and reliable to complete all mandatory reports and also, to help guide the Program’s data-driven decision-making processes. The Child Development Advisor, who is a developmental pediatrician, ensures continuous support to service providers and shares his expertise in the implementation of routine-based strategies, and other evidence-based practices and models as appropriate.   
  
Within the State Office is the Supervision and Monitoring Unit (SMU) comprised of the Evaluator and Data Manager. The SMU schedules regular visits to the regional programs where technical assistance and monitoring activities are carried out. It also provides continuous support to regional programs around data collection and evaluation activities, program procedures, and other programmatic areas as needed. The monitoring activities include record review and analysis, guidance to the personnel based on monitoring results, and data analysis from other reports submitted to the SMU regularly. A data submission calendar is developed and shared with regional programs to ensure timely data submission, a component that is evaluated to issue local regional determinations. Monitoring activities to gather APR data occur once a year between July and September, after the fiscal year that is being evaluated ends. These are SMU on-site visits in which a random sample of records is selected for review. If events of non-compliance are identified, the Program Evaluator and Data Manager explain the reasons the SMU will issue a finding of non-compliance and provide a set of recommendations to improve performance. This allows Supervisors to design and implement strategies to ensure compliance. Regular submission of COS and family outcomes data is also evaluated, and the SMU regularly engages in data quality activities to ensure that the data are valid and reliable. Collection of dispute resolution data is also included in the monitoring activities led by the SMU to ensure compliance with Part C due processes.  
  
Each of the seven (7) regional programs is led by a Regional Supervisor who is responsible for the intake and Service Coordinators' supervision. The Regional Supervisor also facilitates the implementation of strategies to support children with disabilities and their families to improve their outcomes by overseeing all the regional program’s activities, including data collection as designed by the Evaluator and reporting back to the state office. They also work daily with service providers to ensure the provision of services and any other support to families as required under IDEA C.   
  
If challenges in any of these areas arise, they are discussed in monthly meetings with all regional supervisors and the state team. New activities and strategies are designed, planned, implemented, and evaluated, either island-wide or in a specific regional program as needed.

**Technical Assistance System:**

**The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence-based technical assistance and support to early intervention service (EIS) programs.**

The mechanisms implemented by the Puerto Rico Early Intervention Program to ensure the timely delivery of high-quality, evidence-based technical assistance and support to our regional programs are led by the SMU and the Child Development Consultant, who is a Pediatrician that specializes in developmental pediatrics. The Consultant works closely with the SMU to address identified needs related to early intervention service provision strategies, development of functional outcomes in the IFSP, eligibility determination and assessment, as well as child outcomes data. He has an extensive background in child development and is very knowledgeable of the IDEA Part C regulations, the Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA) guidelines, DEC best practices, and child outcomes measurement. Concurrently, the SMU—with a wide knowledge of IDEA regulations, data collection methods and analysis, monitoring and evaluation activities, and DoH system procedures— continuously identifies and addresses needs to support the regional programs. By providing the needed support, the State Office helps the programs have the tools for families to help their children to develop and learn. The Consultant and SMU are available to address personnel concerns via telephone, email, or through the development of educational material for their convenience. Training sessions are also designed and implemented to address more specific personnel questions and needs, and for strengthening the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD). Personnel needs are identified either through monthly meetings with the Regional Supervisors, on-site monitoring activities, data collection, and analysis, or questions asked to the State Office personnel.   
  
Tools developed by the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA), the Center for Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy), and information made available by OSEP are also included in the TA system, as the State Office distributes, shares, and discusses important topics as needed. Periodic conference calls with technical assistance personnel from some of the TA centers are scheduled to discuss the implementation of strategies to improve results and ensure continued support and high-quality early intervention services. New strategies to strengthen this system have been thought out by the State Office as needs continue to be identified. For example, in FFY 2021, the PREIP started receiving specific technical assistance from the Center for Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA) for the implementation of the new eligibility and assessment tool for the jurisdiction. This work has been laid out for a few years in the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). This technical assistance has been comprehensive and has included topics regarding Puerto Rico's definition of developmental delay and informed clinical opinion. ECTA also provided technical assistance regarding personnel shortages in the jurisdiction, and around data with the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy). Personnel shortages have worsened because of the COVID-19 pandemic and the PREIP has been actively having conversations and implementing activities toward working with this issue. Personnel from ECTA has shared strategies from other states, and have helped guide conversations with the program's personnel. They have also shared useful information and materials developed by other technical assistance centers, and their own. Another important project for which the PREIP has received technical assistance is the implementation of a new data system. Personnel from DaSy has been actively assisting the PREIP state office team in the development of a Request for Proposals (RFP) to contract a vendor to design and implement the new solution for Puerto Rico. The RFP is an activity executed in FFY 2022.

**Professional Development System:**

**The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.**

The Child Development Consultant is the person within the State Office who is in charge of training service providers on topics regarding the delivery of services in natural environments to improve results for infants and toddlers with developmental delay and their families. Training is usually provided on-site in each EI regional Program or at the State Office. During FFY 2021, training sessions or colloquiums were still conducted virtually due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Regional Supervisors meet monthly with the Part C Coordinator to discuss providers’ performance in natural environments, COS ratings, and other relevant topics. These meetings inform the design and implementation of new strategies and technical assistance meetings in order to improve those areas. The Consultant is in charge of gathering their input and coordinating meetings to provide technical assistance and continuous training to ensure that providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. Some of the activities led by the Consultant include continuous availability to address personnel concerns via telephone, and email, and the development of educational material for their convenience. Training sessions are also designed and implemented to address more specific personnel questions and needs, and for strengthening the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD). Personnel needs are identified either through monthly meetings with the Regional Supervisors, on-site monitoring activities, data collection, and analysis, or other questions asked to the State Office.   
  
Another resource that is often included in the PREIP professional development system is the PR University Center of Excellence on Developmental Disabilities Education, Research and Service (PRUCEDD) at the Graduate School of Public Health, University of Puerto Rico, Medical Sciences Campus. Dr. Carol Salas, its Director, is the newly elected President of the Association of the University Centers on Disabilities (AUCD). Dr. Salas and the team at the PRUCEDD frequently collaborate with the PREIP and provide training as solicited. During the past 8 years, they have also provided training around service coordination, family-centered services, coaching as an evidence-based practice, and the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ). More recent collaborations include providing training sessions to the PREIP on the new eligibility/assessment tool, the Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System for Infants and Children (AEPS). As part of the State Systemic Improvement Plan, PR EIP established and has maintained an agreement with the University of Puerto Rico UCEDD/LEND Program to serve as the early intervention system scientific partner. With this collaboration, the system personnel will receive the latest information and in-service training in other topics such as evidence-based practices that can be translated into strategies to ensure high-quality services. Full implementation of the AEPS was intended for 2022 but the PREIP was receiving important technical assistance, hence this activity is now expected for FFY 2022 continuing on FFY 2023. The training was designed to introduce the personnel to the new tool, explain the eligibility determinations and child assessment process, and how to incorporate it in the routines-based model. These sessions also include training on coaching, which is the selected evidence-based practice for Puerto Rico. In FFY 2019, the PREIP began discussions to change the tool used in eligibility determination evaluations. The PRUCEDD submitted a proposal to the Program and was on its way to being accepted when a lockdown was announced on March 15th, 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. As everything in the territory shut down and the staff was teleworking, these efforts were delayed. Soon after people began to return to the offices, the process of reviewing and accepting the proposal resumed, and was accepted. Training sessions started in September 2021. The last phase of these training sessions is expected to be conducted in early 2023. These are practical sessions for service providers and coordinators prior to the implementation phase. The tool will be implemented in two regional programs and a process and outcomes evaluation will be conducted to guide full implementation in all regional programs. This evaluation will be conducted by the Programmatic Management Unit (PMU) of the Auxiliary Secretariat for Family Health, Integrated Services and Health Promotion of the PRDoH. The PMU is comprised of program evaluators, data analysts, and health educators. These professionals will assist the PREIP in the development of an evaluation plan and formal process and outcomes evaluations to ensure this process is to the benefit of the program and will help improve child outcomes. The results of this evaluation process will not only be shared with our stakeholders but will help identify professional development needs and will be included in the program's decision-making process.   
  
Tools developed by ECTA, the IDEA Center for Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy), and information made available by OSEP are also included in the Professional Development System, as the State Office distributes, shares, and discusses important topics as needed.

**Broad Stakeholder Input:**

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

The Puerto Rico State Interagency Coordination Council (PRSICC) is the group that brings together the main PREIP stakeholders. The group is composed of representatives of the Puerto Rico University Center of Excellence on Developmental Disabilities (UPR UCEDD/LEND), the Families and Children’s Affairs Administration, the Association of Parents of Children with Disabilities (APNI), the Health Services Administration, the Mental Health Services Administration, the Health Insurance Commissioner, Centro Margarita (Service Community-Based Organization), NY Foundling, the Office of the Ombudsman for Persons with Disabilities, SER de Puerto Rico (Service Community-Based Organization), Medicaid, the Department of Education, the State Head Start/Early Head Start Collaboration Office, and the Army Educational & Developmental Intervention Services (EDIS). It is important to note that in FFY 2019 some positions became vacant, but the PREIP will continue its efforts to recruit new members to ensure a broad representation of the program's stakeholders. During FFY 2021-2022, the SICC worked together in 4 meetings to provide input on issues regarding personnel development, SSIP, and compliance with IDEA requirements, and to continue discussing relevant information and data to select targets for compliance and results indicators for FFY 2020-2025. The SICC held its FFY 2021 meetings on September 2021, November 2021, January 2022, and April 2022. This meeting was convened to discuss new data and context around indicators 5 and 6 targets and baselines. New data, information, and scenarios were presented by the State Office to reach new agreements. All conversations held with the ICC are centered on data collected by the SMU, scientific literature, and the group's experience, so the decision-making process of the Program is widely informed. The SICC also provides feedback about the State Determination issued by OSEP and discusses recommendations for new strategies to improve all Programs’ areas as needed.  
  
In the January 2023 SICC meeting, the state office team presented the data regarding the 2023 SPP/APR submission and it was approved. Discussions were mostly around indicator 3 data, a higher number of referrals of children with autism in the EDIS Fort Buchanan (military base), the effect on child outcomes data, and the next steps to continue discussing the strategies and activities that have been selected by the state. One parent member was discussing her experiences receiving early intervention services and was interested in how these are reflected in the data and help improve child outcomes. Other members discussed the purpose of Part C services and how essential family engagement is in improving child outcomes.   
  
During FFY 2022, the PREIP expects to have new members, including new parents, and add representation of the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Program.

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

YES

**Number of Parent Members:**

0

**Parent Members Engagement:**

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

Puerto Rico has had challenges over the past years to have active parent members in the SICC. In FFY 2015, 4 parent members were designated and appointed but there were challenges for them to participate actively. With the change in leadership, and fewer personnel in the State Office, ICC meetings got delayed. When they resumed, multiple attempts of contact were made with no success. After a few ICC meetings with no parent participation, these positions have become vacant. This need has been identified by the jurisdiction and continues to be included in the PREIP's logic model and evaluation plan as part of the family engagement action strand. Puerto Rico intends to recruit new parent members with the assistance of the Parent Training and Information Center (PTIC)-Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (APNI, by its Spanish Acronym), and the PREIP regional teams.   
  
A recent achievement of the PREIP in this area is that in the last ICC meeting in January 2023. Five (5) parent representatives participated in the meeting. These parents are interested in becoming ICC members. The SMU developed and distributed with the help of the regional programs, a survey that collected the families' contact information, and they were invited to participate. During this meeting, parents discussed child outcomes and service provision during the COVID-19 pandemic. The formal process of appointing parent members in the SICC will soon start to promote families' participation.

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

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

The PREIP has encountered difficulties to promote their participation. As the Program has identified this need, it has been established as a priority to appoint parent members that can support the implementation of activities to improve child outcomes. The PTIC will collaborate with this activity as communication and collaboration between this organization and the PREIP have strengthened. The regional programs will also work on this effort of identifying new parent members. Additionally, the training for the implementation of the new eligibility and assessment tool has sessions designed to present the new process to families so they can provide their input. Their participation will allow the Program to implement this new process taking into consideration the families' views and concerns. This is fundamental to maintaining a family-centered system of services.  
  
The PREIP also had conversations with the Puerto Rico Family-to-Family Center (F2F) to start a joint project aimed at the family engagement strand and child find strategies. The PREIP expects this will help increase the capacity of parents to support the implementation to improve child outcomes. It is expected that this project will start in FFY 2022.

**Soliciting Public Input:**

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

The ICC met 4 times during FFY 2021 for these purposes. One meeting had the purpose of analyzing data, and the new baseline and target for indicator 5 for the clarification process. The Council also met for the usual discussion of the SPP/APR. At each meeting, the ICC agrees on the date and time of the next meeting. At least two weeks prior to the meeting the ICC membership is sent a friendly reminder of the meeting. Minutes, agendas, and presentations are distributed prior to the meeting as well to help stakeholders engage in the conversations.

**Making Results Available to the Public:**

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

All results from the discussions addressing data analysis, target setting, implementation of strategies, and evaluation are made available through the sharing of presentations, data sets if necessary, meeting agendas, and minutes to the SICC members. Other reports, such as the APR, public reporting, and the grant application are published as required, on the Department of Health website. This site is available to the general community and allows for other agencies and entities to have data available. This also allows for collaborations with these programs. All information is published as soon as possible within the required timelines.

**Reporting to the Public:**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2020 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 2020 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 2020 APR in 2022, is available.**

As required, the PREIP makes all data and information publicly available regarding all regional Early Intervention Program's performance in all compliance and results indicators. The FFY 2020 APR and the Public Reporting can be found using the link below:  
  
https://www.salud.gov.pr/CMS/DOWNLOAD/6797

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

Puerto Rico's IDEA Part C determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In Puerto Rico's 2022 determination letter, the Department advised Puerto Rico of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required Puerto Rico to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed Puerto Rico to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance.   
  
Puerto Rico must report, with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which Puerto Rico received assistance; and (2) the actions Puerto Rico took as a result of that technical assistance.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

Puerto Rico has received technical assistance regarding various needs that have been identified by the state office team with the SICC and TA centers. Discussions around personnel shortages have been held with ECTA/DaSy and as a result, the PREIP has had active conversations with the regional programs, and private organizations contracted by the Department of Health to provide early interventions services to explore challenges and barriers to identifying, hiring and retaining personnel. The Program has also taken action and has started the process to hire new personnel to address this issue.   
  
Another important TA received from DaSy was related to data. As a result, PR improved its reporting and did not include children exiting the program that were served for less than 6 months. The PREIP expects to have improved in the data anomalies section of the state determination as a result of this effort.  
  
DaSy/ECTA also collaborated with the development of a request for proposal for a new data system, a broad activity that has been included in the accountability and monitoring strand of action in the SSIP. As a result, a new data system is expected to be implemented in FFY 2023.   
  
Last but not least, DaSy and ECTA have supported the PREIP through the process of adopting the new eligibility and assessment tool and have also facilitated discussions around the definition of developmental delays for the jurisdiction. As a result, the program expects to continue training the personnel and implementing a pilot project which will be evaluated by a group of professionals that includes program evaluators, data analysts, and health educators to guide full implementation.   
  
The PREIP will continue to work with these TA Centers to continue implementing strategies aimed at improving child outcomes in the jurisdiction.

## 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.  
  
Puerto Rico's determinations for both 2021 and 2022 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to sections 616(e)(1) and 642 of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 303.704(a), OSEP's June 22, 2022 determination letter informed Puerto Rico that it must report with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which Puerto Rico received assistance; and (2) the actions Puerto Rico took as a result of that technical assistance. Puerto Rico provided the required information.

## 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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 | 80.50% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 97.81% | 93.94% | 98.48% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 211 | 238 | 100.00% | 100% | 97.90% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Slippage is observed in this indicator due to difficulties in recruiting and retaining personnel to provide services. These barriers have been experienced by the program for several years now, but have worsened due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The SMU reviewed 238 records for indicator 1 and identified 27 events of non-compliance where services were delivered after the 30-day period that is permitted. Twenty-two cases were related to extraordinary family circumstances and 5 cases were due to a reason related to the Program. In the five non-compliance findings for reasons related to the Program, services were not provided on time due to problems getting these children assigned to a service provider, therefore exceeding the 30-day timeline. Puerto Rico continues to present barriers to contracting and retaining service providers. The jurisdiction has had meetings and conversations with the entities that are contracted by the PRDoH to provide services with the purpose to explore barriers to recruiting and retaining personnel. These meetings have also included the regional supervisors to promote having conversations that include all perspectives. In these conversations, the state office team has also shared relevant information to support the entities to be able to hire and retain personnel such as that shared through the OSEP Ideas that Work website related to the 2020 National Summit on Attract, Prepare and Retain: Effective Personnel for All. These entities/corporations have expressed that they see a lower number of professionals on the Island and that they have employed multiple efforts to identify personnel, such as webpage and socials announcements and connecting with some of the island’s colleges and universities. They have committed to continue implementing these strategies. The Supervision and Monitoring Unit (SMU) also designed and conducted a survey to explore barriers to providing services. The PR EIP makes all efforts to provide services on time and started the procedures to contract more service providers.

**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.***

22

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

The SMU reviewed 238 records for Indicator 1 and identified 27 events of non-compliance where services were delivered after the 30-day period that is permitted. Twenty-two cases were related to extraordinary family circumstances and 5 cases were due to a reason related to the Program. In the five non-compliances per program, services were not provided on time due, and there have been problems getting these children assigned to a provider on time.

**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).**

Puerto Rico's criterion to consider that early intervention services were delivered on time is that the period from parent consent at the IFSP meeting to the date of service provision is 30 days or less. During monitoring and data collection activities, the Supervision and Monitoring Unit (SMU) randomly selects records to be reviewed, and specifically, the IFSP date and the date of service provision in the service provider's progress notes are taken into account. This includes the initial IFSP and subsequent revisions. If there is a case where services were provided after the 30-day timeline, the program evaluator will then look for the reasons of delay provided by the service coordinator and service provider(s), to further classify the events of non-compliance as exceptional family circumstances or of program-related causes.

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

State monitoring

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

The PREIP does not sample the regional programs for monitoring activities; all programs are included in data collection and monitoring activities all year round. The SMU selects a random sample of records from all regional programs as the source of data for this indicator. The SMU selected the records for the evaluation of Indicator 1 according to the date of the IFSP meeting. The inclusion criterion was that the IFSP had to be developed between July 1st, 2021, and June 30th, 2022. SPP/APR data collection activities are conducted every year from July to September after the fiscal year ends. The SMU uses the child count data regional programs submit to the state office to produce a list of records that fall within the inclusion criterion for this indicator. Based on the population, the random sample size is calculated using the web-based tool, OpenEpi and, a list of random numbers is created using the random numbers module of the same tool. Records are chosen matching the number from the list of the random numbers to the record number from the child count report. For all regional programs, data were collected through on-site monitoring activities conducted by the SMU, explaining all the processes and their importance to the regional supervisors as a significant process of education and corrective actions that take place. Non-compliance events are also shared and explained to the supervisor. After the on-site data collection is completed, the SMU performs the analysis and, if necessary, phone calls with the regional supervisors are scheduled with the purpose of asking for additional information. Documented exceptional family circumstances that prevented the timely provision of services are included in the numerator and denominator to calculate the data.

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

Given the turnover of providers, and the difficulty of identifying and hiring more professionals, the Supervision and Monitoring Unit (SMU) at the State Office developed a survey for the professionals that provide or have provided services with the Early Intervention. The purpose of this survey was to explore barriers and challenges that services providers have encountered that have made them decide not t continue as EIP service providers or give less time to serve infants and toddlers in PR. As a result of the survey, we identified that in addition to having fewer providers than in previous years, the providers that responded stated that they have very limited or partially available time to take on new cases (67% of respondents). This was due to having multiple jobs (71%) or that they are still in school (11%). On the other hand, 29% of respondents were service providers no longer working for the PREIP. Added to the shortages and limited time of service providers is the increase in referrals received. For FFY 2021-2022, the program had a 36.7% increase in referred children compared to FFY 2020-2021. The survey that we conducted also collected recommendations for providers that will help the State Team Office improve the experience for service providers. The state office has also started the process of identifying and hiring new professionals contracted directly by the Department of Health to address this situation.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **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 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 Puerto Rico reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, Puerto Rico must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator.   
  
When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Puerto Rico must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 SPP/APR, Puerto Rico must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If Puerto Rico did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why Puerto Rico did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

# Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 99.70% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target>= | 99.82% | 99.83% | 99.83% | 99.85% | 99.85% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= | 99.86% | 99.86% | 99.87% | 99.87% | 99.88% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Puerto Rico State Interagency Coordination Council (PRSICC) is the group that brings together the main PREIP stakeholders. The group is composed of representatives of the Puerto Rico University Center of Excellence on Developmental Disabilities (UPR UCEDD/LEND), the Families and Children’s Affairs Administration, the Association of Parents of Children with Disabilities (APNI), the Health Services Administration, the Mental Health Services Administration, the Health Insurance Commissioner, Centro Margarita (Service Community-Based Organization), NY Foundling, the Office of the Ombudsman for Persons with Disabilities, SER de Puerto Rico (Service Community-Based Organization), Medicaid, the Department of Education, the State Head Start/Early Head Start Collaboration Office, and the Army Educational & Developmental Intervention Services (EDIS). It is important to note that in FFY 2019 some positions became vacant, but the PREIP will continue its efforts to recruit new members to ensure a broad representation of the program's stakeholders. During FFY 2021-2022, the SICC worked together in 4 meetings to provide input on issues regarding personnel development, SSIP, and compliance with IDEA requirements, and to continue discussing relevant information and data to select targets for compliance and results indicators for FFY 2020-2025. The SICC held its FFY 2021 meetings on September 2021, November 2021, January 2022, and April 2022. This meeting was convened to discuss new data and context around indicators 5 and 6 targets and baselines. New data, information, and scenarios were presented by the State Office to reach new agreements. All conversations held with the ICC are centered on data collected by the SMU, scientific literature, and the group's experience, so the decision-making process of the Program is widely informed. The SICC also provides feedback about the State Determination issued by OSEP and discusses recommendations for new strategies to improve all Programs’ areas as needed.  
  
In the January 2023 SICC meeting, the state office team presented the data regarding the 2023 SPP/APR submission and it was approved. Discussions were mostly around indicator 3 data, a higher number of referrals of children with autism in the EDIS Fort Buchanan (military base), the effect on child outcomes data, and the next steps to continue discussing the strategies and activities that have been selected by the state. One parent member was discussing her experiences receiving early intervention services and was interested in how these are reflected in the data and help improve child outcomes. Other members discussed the purpose of Part C services and how essential family engagement is in improving child outcomes.   
  
During FFY 2022, the PREIP expects to have new members, including new parents, and add representation of the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Program.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age | 07/06/2022 | Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings | 2,111 |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age | 07/06/2022 | Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs | 2,111 |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2,111 | 2,111 | 100.00% | 99.86% | 100.00% | 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**

The Puerto Rico State Interagency Coordination Council (PRSICC) is the group that brings together the main PREIP stakeholders. The group is composed of representatives of the Puerto Rico University Center of Excellence on Developmental Disabilities (UPR UCEDD/LEND), the Families and Children’s Affairs Administration, the Association of Parents of Children with Disabilities (APNI), the Health Services Administration, the Mental Health Services Administration, the Health Insurance Commissioner, Centro Margarita (Service Community-Based Organization), NY Foundling, the Office of the Ombudsman for Persons with Disabilities, SER de Puerto Rico (Service Community-Based Organization), Medicaid, the Department of Education, the State Head Start/Early Head Start Collaboration Office, and the Army Educational & Developmental Intervention Services (EDIS). It is important to note that in FFY 2019 some positions became vacant, but the PREIP will continue its efforts to recruit new members to ensure a broad representation of the program's stakeholders. During FFY 2021-2022, the SICC worked together in 4 meetings to provide input on issues regarding personnel development, SSIP, and compliance with IDEA requirements, and to continue discussing relevant information and data to select targets for compliance and results indicators for FFY 2020-2025. The SICC held its FFY 2021 meetings on September 2021, November 2021, January 2022, and April 2022. This meeting was convened to discuss new data and context around indicators 5 and 6 targets and baselines. New data, information, and scenarios were presented by the State Office to reach new agreements. All conversations held with the ICC are centered on data collected by the SMU, scientific literature, and the group's experience, so the decision-making process of the Program is widely informed. The SICC also provides feedback about the State Determination issued by OSEP and discusses recommendations for new strategies to improve all Programs’ areas as needed.  
  
In the January 2023 SICC meeting, the state office team presented the data regarding the 2023 SPP/APR submission and it was approved. Discussions were mostly around indicator 3 data, a higher number of referrals of children with autism in the EDIS Fort Buchanan (military base), the effect on child outcomes data, and the next steps to continue discussing the strategies and activities that have been selected by the state. One parent member was discussing her experiences receiving early intervention services and was interested in how these are reflected in the data and help improve child outcomes. Other members discussed the purpose of Part C services and how essential family engagement is in improving child outcomes.   
  
During FFY 2022, the PREIP expects to have new members, including new parents, and add representation of the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Program.

During FFY 2020, The SICC and the EIP State Office Team had various discussions around indicator 3, historic data and performance, data quality, data collection, and analysis procedures to select the targets. Given that discussions regarding data may be difficult for people, the SMU decided to present the Program's data using different graphs, such as pie and bar charts, as well as tables to summarize data and lead the discussions. The SMU presented historic data and other data from various reports, such as national average data on the indicators. These data were presented in scenarios so that ICC members could contrast, compare, analyze, and conclude the best scenarios for Puerto Rico. All scenarios represented different targets to choose from. Members expressed their opinion and knowledge about the scenarios, taking into account the current reality. They also considered past events that PR has gone through, such as hurricanes and earthquakes, besides the current pandemic. They also discussed different elements that have an impact on child development, results improvement, data collection, and analysis procedures, implementation of the evidence-based practice, and service coordination and provision. Some of these elements are the level of poverty, and the external events as those already mentioned.  
  
In FFY 2021, the stakeholder input was a general discussion of results and how services impact/improve child outcomes. There were no discussions around changing targets or about other possible concerns.

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| **A1** | 2011 | Target>= | 43.82% | 43.83% | 43.84% | 58.60% | 43.85% |
| **A1** | 39.40% | Data | 67.11% | 58.49% | 58.59% | 51.88% | 43.09% |
| **A2** | 2011 | Target>= | 57.02% | 57.03% | 57.04% | 84.21% | 57.05% |
| **A2** | 53.90% | Data | 85.14% | 81.70% | 84.31% | 83.06% | 75.81% |
| **B1** | 2011 | Target>= | 46.66% | 46.67% | 46.68% | 71.56% | 46.69% |
| **B1** | 32.50% | Data | 76.03% | 72.74% | 71.55% | 67.71% | 58.55% |
| **B2** | 2011 | Target>= | 34.71% | 34.72% | 34.73% | 53.46% | 34.74% |
| **B2** | 18.70% | Data | 56.04% | 52.38% | 53.45% | 49.85% | 41.73% |
| **C1** | 2011 | Target>= | 38.05% | 38.06% | 38.07% | 56.98% | 38.08% |
| **C1** | 28.30% | Data | 63.54% | 56.12% | 56.98% | 52.44% | 43.75% |
| **C2** | 2011 | Target>= | 51.38% | 51.39% | 51.40% | 77.82% | 51.41% |
| **C2** | 43.90% | Data | 80.75% | 76.62% | 77.81% | 76.69% | 69.57% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A1>= | 43.86% | 43.87% | 43.88% | 43.89% | 43.90% |
| Target A2>= | 57.06% | 57.07% | 57.08% | 57.09% | 57.10% |
| Target B1>= | 46.70% | 46.71% | 46.72% | 46.73% | 46.74% |
| Target B2>= | 34.75% | 34.76% | 34.77% | 34.78% | 34.79% |
| Target C1>= | 38.09% | 38.10% | 38.11% | 38.12% | 38.13% |
| Target C2>= | 51.42% | 51.43% | 51.44% | 51.45% | 51.46% |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

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

1,593

**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 | 31 | 1.95% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 269 | 16.89% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 63 | 3.95% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 214 | 13.43% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,016 | 63.78% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 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 | 277 | 577 | 43.09% | 43.86% | 48.01% | Met 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 | 1,230 | 1,593 | 75.81% | 57.06% | 77.21% | Met target | No Slippage |

**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 | 15 | 0.94% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 528 | 33.15% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 367 | 23.04% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 571 | 35.84% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 112 | 7.03% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 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 | 938 | 1,481 | 58.55% | 46.70% | 63.34% | Met 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 | 683 | 1,593 | 41.73% | 34.75% | 42.88% | Met target | No Slippage |

**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 | 33 | 2.07% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 360 | 22.60% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 85 | 5.34% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 238 | 14.94% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 877 | 55.05% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 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 | 323 | 716 | 43.75% | 38.09% | 45.11% | Met 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 | 1,115 | 1,593 | 69.57% | 51.42% | 69.99% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

| **Question** | **Number** |
| --- | --- |
| The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State’s Part C exiting 618 data | 2,281 |
| 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. | 688 |

| **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.**

All seven (7) local programs in Puerto Rico gather the data through the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF). It is filled out the day the initial eligibility for Part C services is determined, at the annual determination, and at the exit time. The data collected are also transferred to an Excel sheet designed by the Supervision and Monitoring Unit (SMU). This sheet is sent every quarter to the SMU, in which infants and toddlers that exited the Program the month before the submission, are included. If needed, local programs may review records and ask service providers for more information to ensure the data reported are accurate. After submission, the SMU will contact the regional programs if further clarifications are needed. At the time of analysis, the ECTA Center COSF Calculator is used as a guide for data quality and for correcting data issues that were not assessed during the year. The SMU also consolidates the annual regional information into Puerto Rico’s report to use it as indicator 3 data. Puerto Rico used to include in the numerator and denominator children exiting the program that received services for less than six months. The jurisdiction had some data quality issues as specified in the last two (2) state determinations, specifically in the data anomalies section. The PREIP was able to clarify this issue by receiving technical assistance from DaSy. FFY 2021 data excludes children that received services for less than six months.

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

The PREIP continues to improve child outcomes by implementing various strategies. Data quality is still a priority, so procedures to ensure data are valid and reliable are widely adopted by regional programs. Regional nurses continue to have to duty to review child records and if needed, ask for further clarification from the service providers. Also, the developmental pediatrics consultant is always available to provide technical assistance to the PREIP personnel. There was no slippage in this indicator, which shows an increase in all outcomes when compared to FFY 2021. Training for service providers on child development and COS data is scheduled to be offered in FFY 2022.

## 3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3 - OSEP Response

## 3 - Required Actions

# Indicator 4: Family Involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

A. Know their rights;

B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and

C. Help their children develop and learn.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 4 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| A | 2006 | Target>= | 90.49% | 90.50% | 94.51% | 97.45% | 88.00% |
| A | 60.00% | Data | 96.37% | 96.54% | 97.44% | 89.75% | 72.48% |
| B | 2006 | Target>= | 89.09% | 89.10% | 89.11% | 97.19% | 89.00% |
| B | ###C04BBASEDATA### | Data | 96.12% | 95.91% | 97.18% | 89.04% | 69.70% |
| C | 2006 | Target>= | 94.42% | 94.43% | 94.44% | 98.60% | 91.00% |
| C | 79.00% | Data | 98.00% | 98.90% | 98.59% | 93.96% | 80.79% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A>= | 88.01% | 88.02% | 88.03% | 88.04% | 88.05% |
| Target B>= | 89.01% | 89.02% | 89.03% | 89.04% | 89.05% |
| Target C>= | 91.01% | 91.02% | 91.03% | 91.04% | 91.05% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Puerto Rico State Interagency Coordination Council (PRSICC) is the group that brings together the main PREIP stakeholders. The group is composed of representatives of the Puerto Rico University Center of Excellence on Developmental Disabilities (UPR UCEDD/LEND), the Families and Children’s Affairs Administration, the Association of Parents of Children with Disabilities (APNI), the Health Services Administration, the Mental Health Services Administration, the Health Insurance Commissioner, Centro Margarita (Service Community-Based Organization), NY Foundling, the Office of the Ombudsman for Persons with Disabilities, SER de Puerto Rico (Service Community-Based Organization), Medicaid, the Department of Education, the State Head Start/Early Head Start Collaboration Office, and the Army Educational & Developmental Intervention Services (EDIS). It is important to note that in FFY 2019 some positions became vacant, but the PREIP will continue its efforts to recruit new members to ensure a broad representation of the program's stakeholders. During FFY 2021-2022, the SICC worked together in 4 meetings to provide input on issues regarding personnel development, SSIP, and compliance with IDEA requirements, and to continue discussing relevant information and data to select targets for compliance and results indicators for FFY 2020-2025. The SICC held its FFY 2021 meetings on September 2021, November 2021, January 2022, and April 2022. This meeting was convened to discuss new data and context around indicators 5 and 6 targets and baselines. New data, information, and scenarios were presented by the State Office to reach new agreements. All conversations held with the ICC are centered on data collected by the SMU, scientific literature, and the group's experience, so the decision-making process of the Program is widely informed. The SICC also provides feedback about the State Determination issued by OSEP and discusses recommendations for new strategies to improve all Programs’ areas as needed.  
  
In the January 2023 SICC meeting, the state office team presented the data regarding the 2023 SPP/APR submission and it was approved. Discussions were mostly around indicator 3 data, a higher number of referrals of children with autism in the EDIS Fort Buchanan (military base), the effect on child outcomes data, and the next steps to continue discussing the strategies and activities that have been selected by the state. One parent member was discussing her experiences receiving early intervention services and was interested in how these are reflected in the data and help improve child outcomes. Other members discussed the purpose of Part C services and how essential family engagement is in improving child outcomes.   
  
During FFY 2022, the PREIP expects to have new members, including new parents, and add representation of the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Program.

To establish targets for indicators 4a, 4b, and 4c for the new package starting in FFY 2020, the PREIP reviewed and analyzed data trends in family outcomes over the years. FFY 2019 data showed historically low percentages. In this fiscal year, Puerto Rico suffered a series of earthquakes prior to the lockdown imposed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. These events meant that the program had to accommodate to the emerging necessities. The SMU used Google Forms as a method to collect the family outcomes data while services were provided virtually due to stay-at-home orders established by the government. In order to select appropriate targets for these indicators, the SMU reviewed historical data, and targets and used the ECTA Indicator Analysis for various fiscal years to compare the historical national average to Puerto Rico. The PREIP presented three (3) possible scenarios to the stakeholders to start discussions and agree on a target. The first scenario compared the 2013 national average data with PR’s 2019 data. The second one presented the 2018 national average data as PR’s targets and the third one considers PR’s 2019 data as the FFY 2020 target. After reviewing the jurisdiction context and challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic, such as the sudden change in the modality of service provision, the ICC recommended the PREIP to select 2013’s national average as FFY 2020 target. We discussed the importance of choosing an appropriate target that would also show improvement over the baseline.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The number of families to whom surveys were distributed | 1,083 |
| Number of respondent families participating in Part C | 620 |
| Survey Response Rate | 57.25% |
| A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 477 |
| A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 620 |
| 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 | 474 |
| B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | 620 |
| 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 | 527 |
| C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn | 620 |

| **Measure** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 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) | 72.48% | 88.01% | 76.94% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2) | 69.70% | 89.01% | 76.45% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2) | 80.79% | 91.01% | 85.00% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

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

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

**Survey Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Survey Response Rate | 48.23% | 57.25% |

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

The PREIP has established a system where regional programs must submit a report on the survey’s data collection efforts to the SMU on a monthly basis. These data are then analyzed, comparing data collection efforts done by the regional centers and their response rate, and presented in the monthly meetings with the supervisors. This allows the supervisors to see the performance of their respective regional programs, share challenges to collect the data, and discuss possible strategies to strengthen these efforts. These discussions also include the importance of representation when considering this indicator. One of these strategies included using the data entry personnel in regional programs where the response rate is low, to help service coordinators follow up on families that had previously agreed to fill out but had not. The regional teams also offer support to these families and send friendly reminders via text message when appropriate. The PREIP team has seen an increase in the response rate compared to last year. For FFY 2021 the response rate is 57.25% whereas last year's response rate was 48.23%.

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

Puerto Rico has implemented a system to promote a response from a broad cross-section of families. We collect sociodemographic data that allow the SMU to draw conclusions about the families that answer the survey. For example, 2022 cumulative child count data show that 65.59% of the infants and toddlers served are male and 34.42% were female. Survey data show that 67% of families who answered it had an infant or toddler who is male, compared to 33% who were female.   
  
During monthly meetings with the regional supervisors, this topic is addressed. The SMU always emphasizes the need of collecting data that represents families that receive early intervention services in Puerto Rico that supports the Program in drawing accurate conclusions for an informed decision-making process. Service coordinators explain the purpose of the survey to families that meet the inclusion criteria and, they offer consent if they want to fill out the survey. During the pandemic, the SMU had to distribute the survey to service coordinators as a Google Form link, as services we provided virtually. After in-person services were resumed, services coordinators could distribute the survey to families, either digitally using the Google Form link or can provide the hard-copy version, depending on the families’ preferences. The team thought this strategy would help raise the response rate accounting for families that do not have the necessary equipment to access the link or do not have the knowledge to fill it out digitally. Service coordinators also assist families in accessing the link if necessary. Nevertheless, during FFY 2021, the surveys returned by families were only filled out through the link provided.

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

Using the 22-item scale of the NCSEAM Survey, the Puerto Rico EIP has collected the data through a self-administered online questionnaire for families who opted to complete the survey anonymously.  
  
Every family with a child receiving Part C services for at least six (6) months at the time of the exit had the opportunity to partake in the survey. The family survey response group represents the population of children that were active in the Early Intervention Program (EIP) from July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022 in every regional program, by age group, eligibility criteria, and geographic location. Surveys were returned from 7 EIPs throughout Puerto Rico. In total, 620 surveys were returned.  
  
Puerto Rico has selected to apply the standards recommended by NCSEAM as a way of obtaining the percent to be reported for Indicators 4a, 4b, and 4c. To establish a recommended standard, NCSEAM convened a group of nationally representative stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, state directors of special education, state early intervention coordinators, district and program personnel, advocates, attorneys, and community representatives. Participants were invited to examine a set of items from the IFS, laid out in their calibration order. The items towards the bottom of the scale, having lower calibrations, are items that families tend to agree with most.  
  
The items towards the top of the scale, having higher calibrations, are items that families tend to agree with least. Because of the robust structure of the scale, a respondent who agrees with a given statement will have a very high likelihood of agreeing or agreeing even more strongly, with all the items below it on the scale.

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

Every family that meets the selection criteria has a chance to complete the survey. The SMU collects sociodemographic data that allow the Program to analyze if the survey data are representative of the families receiving early intervention services in Puerto Rico and see if any group is underrepresented. Two of the variables collected when families complete the survey are gender and reason for eligibility (developmental delay, medical diagnosis, and informed clinical opinion). Of the 620 families that answered the survey, 414 (66%) were families of a child who was male, and 206 (33.23%) were families of a child who was female. Compared to the target population, FFY 2021 child count data show that 1,488 (65%) children were male whereas 794 (34.8%) were female. Additionally, (86%) of the surveys were returned by families with infants or toddlers determined eligible for Part C services because of developmental delays, (9%) because of a medical diagnosis, and (5%) because of the teams’ informed clinical opinion. This is comparable to child count data that show the percentage of infants and toddlers who are determined eligible for early intervention services because of developmental delays (88%), medical diagnoses (8%), and informed clinical opinion (5%). Thus, the survey data are aligned with the population and representative of the families we serve. This conclusion is confirmed when calculating representativeness using the ECTA calculator.  
  
Puerto Rico used the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) representativeness calculator to determine if survey data are representative of families receiving Part C services. According to the ECTA Center, the calculator uses an accepted formula (Chi-square test) to evaluate the statistical significance of the overall table. If this overall test shows no significant difference, the data are representative of the population. If the overall test shows a significant difference, the calculator then uses an accepted formula (z test of proportional difference) to determine whether the difference between the two percentages is statistically significant (or meaningful), based upon the 90% confidence intervals for each indicator (significance level = 0.10). This tool allows the SMU to have more knowledge regarding the data that are collected to strengthen the overall decision-making process.

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

The state office team of the PREIP has been having conversations regarding equity and representativeness of families receiving Part C services, Going forward, the program plans to include more variables that allow us to know more of the families completing the survey. These variables are "time spent in early intervention" and "geographic location". Data associated with this last variable are collected when parents are completing the survey but this is not documented in our child data in order for the team to be able to make comparisons to the target populations and draw conclusions accordingly. Beginning in FFY 2023, data for these variables will be collected in both child count data and the survey.

## 4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4 - OSEP Response

## 4 - Required Actions

# Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 0.43% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target >= | 0.53% | 0.55% | 0.57% | 0.58% | 0.43% |
| Data | 0.44% | 0.39% | 0.51% | 0.77% | 0.43% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 0.44% | 0.45% | 0.46% | 0.47% | 0.48% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Puerto Rico State Interagency Coordination Council (PRSICC) is the group that brings together the main PREIP stakeholders. The group is composed of representatives of the Puerto Rico University Center of Excellence on Developmental Disabilities (UPR UCEDD/LEND), the Families and Children’s Affairs Administration, the Association of Parents of Children with Disabilities (APNI), the Health Services Administration, the Mental Health Services Administration, the Health Insurance Commissioner, Centro Margarita (Service Community-Based Organization), NY Foundling, the Office of the Ombudsman for Persons with Disabilities, SER de Puerto Rico (Service Community-Based Organization), Medicaid, the Department of Education, the State Head Start/Early Head Start Collaboration Office, and the Army Educational & Developmental Intervention Services (EDIS). It is important to note that in FFY 2019 some positions became vacant, but the PREIP will continue its efforts to recruit new members to ensure a broad representation of the program's stakeholders. During FFY 2021-2022, the SICC worked together in 4 meetings to provide input on issues regarding personnel development, SSIP, and compliance with IDEA requirements, and to continue discussing relevant information and data to select targets for compliance and results indicators for FFY 2020-2025. The SICC held its FFY 2021 meetings on September 2021, November 2021, January 2022, and April 2022. This meeting was convened to discuss new data and context around indicators 5 and 6 targets and baselines. New data, information, and scenarios were presented by the State Office to reach new agreements. All conversations held with the ICC are centered on data collected by the SMU, scientific literature, and the group's experience, so the decision-making process of the Program is widely informed. The SICC also provides feedback about the State Determination issued by OSEP and discusses recommendations for new strategies to improve all Programs’ areas as needed.  
  
In the January 2023 SICC meeting, the state office team presented the data regarding the 2023 SPP/APR submission and it was approved. Discussions were mostly around indicator 3 data, a higher number of referrals of children with autism in the EDIS Fort Buchanan (military base), the effect on child outcomes data, and the next steps to continue discussing the strategies and activities that have been selected by the state. One parent member was discussing her experiences receiving early intervention services and was interested in how these are reflected in the data and help improve child outcomes. Other members discussed the purpose of Part C services and how essential family engagement is in improving child outcomes.   
  
During FFY 2022, the PREIP expects to have new members, including new parents, and add representation of the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Program.

Related to the input received for this indicator, the PREIP had to revise its baseline and target. The SICC met to discuss the scenarios that best fit Puerto Rico's context to inform its selection. Data related to the population trends child find efforts, child count historical data, and challenges related to the decrease in the number of referrals due to the pandemic were discussed. The ICC discussed new strategies for strengthening child find efforts in the years to come in order to meet these targets. In FFY 2021, discussions were held with the Puerto Rico Family-to-Family Center to lead the Family Engagement strand of action. Nevertheless, the activities for this priority are twofold and will also aim at strengthening child find efforts.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age | 07/06/2022 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs | 81 |
| Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021 | 06/28/2022 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 | 18,389 |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs** | **Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 81 | 18,389 | 0.43% | 0.44% | 0.44% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

The PREIP proposed new targets for this indicator and a new baseline on FFY 2020. This was done by taking into account population data and discussing possible scenarios with the program's stakeholders. The FFY 2021 target was met as forecasted, although PR's data is very distant from the national average of 1.25%. The PREIP continues to strengthen its child find system by renewing interagency agreements and maintaining strong relationships with potential referral sources. Also, the Office of Communications of the Department of Health supports the program in publishing in its socials information regarding early intervention services and how to make a referral. Additionally, the service coordinators have been actively sharing with the families materials from the CDC's campaign "Learn the Signs, Act Early" to help them and other caregivers understand child development milestones and make referrals to Early Intervention as needed. Puerto Rico still recognizes the need to continue identifying children from birth to 1, so a few more strategies will be adopted, such as the implementation of the AEPS as the new eligibility and assessment tool, and plans to attend multiple professional conferences as outreach strategies for continuing receiving 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.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

## 6 - Indicator Data

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 2.56% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target >= | 3.11% | 3.12% | 3.13% | 3.35% | 2.59% |
| Data | 3.08% | 2.65% | 3.34% | 2.83% | 2.59% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 2.60% | 2.61% | 2.62% | 2.63% | 2.64% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Puerto Rico State Interagency Coordination Council (PRSICC) is the group that brings together the main PREIP stakeholders. The group is composed of representatives of the Puerto Rico University Center of Excellence on Developmental Disabilities (UPR UCEDD/LEND), the Families and Children’s Affairs Administration, the Association of Parents of Children with Disabilities (APNI), the Health Services Administration, the Mental Health Services Administration, the Health Insurance Commissioner, Centro Margarita (Service Community-Based Organization), NY Foundling, the Office of the Ombudsman for Persons with Disabilities, SER de Puerto Rico (Service Community-Based Organization), Medicaid, the Department of Education, the State Head Start/Early Head Start Collaboration Office, and the Army Educational & Developmental Intervention Services (EDIS). It is important to note that in FFY 2019 some positions became vacant, but the PREIP will continue its efforts to recruit new members to ensure a broad representation of the program's stakeholders. During FFY 2021-2022, the SICC worked together in 4 meetings to provide input on issues regarding personnel development, SSIP, and compliance with IDEA requirements, and to continue discussing relevant information and data to select targets for compliance and results indicators for FFY 2020-2025. The SICC held its FFY 2021 meetings on September 2021, November 2021, January 2022, and April 2022. This meeting was convened to discuss new data and context around indicators 5 and 6 targets and baselines. New data, information, and scenarios were presented by the State Office to reach new agreements. All conversations held with the ICC are centered on data collected by the SMU, scientific literature, and the group's experience, so the decision-making process of the Program is widely informed. The SICC also provides feedback about the State Determination issued by OSEP and discusses recommendations for new strategies to improve all Programs’ areas as needed.  
  
In the January 2023 SICC meeting, the state office team presented the data regarding the 2023 SPP/APR submission and it was approved. Discussions were mostly around indicator 3 data, a higher number of referrals of children with autism in the EDIS Fort Buchanan (military base), the effect on child outcomes data, and the next steps to continue discussing the strategies and activities that have been selected by the state. One parent member was discussing her experiences receiving early intervention services and was interested in how these are reflected in the data and help improve child outcomes. Other members discussed the purpose of Part C services and how essential family engagement is in improving child outcomes.   
  
During FFY 2022, the PREIP expects to have new members, including new parents, and add representation of the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Program.

IN FFY 2021, the PREIP presented data regarding indicator 6 to the ICC in 2 of the 4 meetings that were held during the fiscal year. These two meetings had the purpose of analyzing and discussing census data, population trends, child find efforts, child count historical data, and challenges related to the COVID-19 pandemic, including the decrease in referrals while in lockdown. These discussions were aimed at selecting the target that was reasonable for Puerto Rico. The work group agreed that the current baseline reflects the jurisdiction’s context. The ICC discussed new strategies for strengthening child find efforts in the years to come in order to meet these targets. In FFY 2021, the stakeholders did not express any concern or had new recommendations related to this indicator. IN FFY 2022, discussions were held with the Puerto Rico Family-to-Family Center to lead the Family Engagement strand of action. Nevertheless, the activities for this priority are twofold and will also aim at strengthening child find efforts.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age | 07/06/2022 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs | 2,111 |
| Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021 | 06/28/2022 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 | 59,865 |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs** | **Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2,111 | 59,865 | 2.59% | 2.60% | 3.53% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

Puerto Rico has consistently been meeting the target for this indicator, although slightly under the national average of 3.66%. The PREIP continues to strengthen its child find system by renewing interagency agreements and maintaining strong relationships with potential referral sources. Also, the Office of Communications of the Department of Health supports the program in publishing in its socials information regarding early intervention services and how to make a referral. Additionally, the service coordinators have been actively sharing with the families materials from the CDC's campaign "Learn the Signs, Act Early" to help them and other caregivers understand child development milestones and make referrals to Early Intervention as needed.

## 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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 | 86.80% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 99.15% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 99 | 107 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances**

**This number will be added to the "Number of 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.**

8

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

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

State monitoring

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

The Puerto Rico Part C team selected the records for the evaluation of Indicator 7 taking into account the date of the referral and the date the IFSP was developed. The inclusion criterion for files to be selected for review is that the referral was received in any of our regional offices between July 1st, 2021, and June 30th, 2022. All (7) seven EI programs in Puerto Rico were included for data collection, as the SMU does not sample regional programs. The SPP/APR data collection and monitoring activities are conducted every year from August to September after the fiscal year ends. The SMU uses the child count data that regional programs submit to produce a list of records that fall within the inclusion criterion for this indicator. Based on the population, the random sample size is calculated using the web-based tool, OpenEpi and, a list of random numbers is created using the random numbers module of the same tool. Records are chosen matching the number from the list of random numbers to the record from the child count report. For all regional programs, data were collected through onsite monitoring activities conducted by the SMU, explaining all the processes and their importance to the regional supervisors. Non-compliance events are also shared and explained to the supervisor, as an important process of education and corrective actions that take place. After the on-site data collection is made, the SMU performs the analysis and, if necessary, phone calls with the regional supervisors are scheduled with the purpose of asking for additional information. Documented exceptional family circumstances that prevented initial evaluation, assessment, and an initial IFSP meeting to be conducted in 45 days or less after the referral is received, are included in the numerator and denominator to calculate the data.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **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 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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

# Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

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

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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 | 96.10% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 96.03% | 95.90% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

| **Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 95 | 96 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

1

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

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

State monitoring

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

The PREIP includes all regional programs in the monitoring activities for this indicator. The Supervision and Monitoring Unit selected the files for evaluating Indicator 8A according to the date recorded in the EI Data System that transition steps and services should have been developed. The inclusion criterion to select the files for review is toddlers whose third birthday was between September 29th, 2021 and September 28th, 2022, who were determined potentially eligible for Part B services and for whom transition steps were required to be developed at least 90 days prior the child's third birthday. Hence, the records selected were due to have their transition steps developed between July 1st, 2021, and June 30th, 2022. All (7) seven EI programs in Puerto Rico were included for data collection, which takes place every year from July to September after the fiscal year ends. The SMU uses child count data that regional programs submit to the state office to produce a list of records that fall within the inclusion criterion for this indicator. Based on the population, the sample size is calculated using the web-based tool OpenEpi. The tool's random numbers module creates a list of random numbers. Each record on the list has an assigned number starting from 1.   
Records that are monitored are chosen matching the number from the list of random numbers to the number assigned to the record from the child count report. For all regional programs, data were collected through onsite monitoring activities conducted by the SMU, explaining all the processes and their importance to the regional supervisors as a process of education and corrective action takes place. Non-compliance events are also shared and explained to the supervisor. After the on-site data collection is made, the SMU performs the analysis and, if necessary, phone calls with the regional supervisors are scheduled with the purpose of asking for additional information. Documented exceptional family circumstances that prevented the timely planning of transition steps and services are included in the numerator and denominator to calculate the data.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **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 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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

# Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

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

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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 | 91.40% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 93.50% | 85.25% | 90.57% | 91.67% | 92.86% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 93 | 96 | 92.86% | 100% | 97.89% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Number of parents who opted out**

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

1

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

For Indicator 8B, three cases of non-compliance were identified in the regional programs of Fajardo and Arecibo. In these three cases, the programs did not report that children receiving early intervention services were potentially eligible for part B services 90 days or less before the toddlers’ third birthday. Each regional program has a system to report to the Part C state office children that are potentially eligible for Part B services using the service coordinators' caseloads (excel sheets) and the data system. The state office then sends a monthly list that includes all regional programs to the SEA which constitutes the formal notification to the Puerto Rico Department of Education. The SMU conducts monitoring activities for the APR data collection by selecting a random sample of files to review. The monthly lists are compared to the sample to ensure that the notification was made as required. The SMU has identified the need to strengthen these systems since the notification to SEA/LEA is not always completed. This will continue to be included in technical assistance sessions, training sessions, and monthly supervisor meetings as one of the methods for non-compliance correction. Also, we have strengthened collaborative arrangements with Part B by holding regular team meetings to discuss challenges and strategies to improve data quality and on-time delivery.  
  
Although the PREIP did not meet the target for this indicator, an improvement has been observed compared to the last federal fiscal year. One of the strategies adopted by the regional programs is for service coordinators to report their transition meetings and children that are potentially eligible for Part B services on a weekly basis instead of monthly, with the purpose of decreasing the possibility that notification to SEA is not completed as required. Also, continuous conversations have been held between Part C and Part B teams to design a module within Part B's data system solely to facilitate notification to SEA. This module is expected to go live in 2023.

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

Puerto Rico Part C team selected the records for the evaluation of Indicator 8B according to the notification to SEA/LEA date recorded in the EI Data System and the monthly report regional supervisors submit to the state office. The inclusion criterion for record selection was toddlers whose third birthday was between September 29th, 2021 and September 28th, 2022, who were determined potentially eligible for Part B services, and for whom notification to the SEA/LEA was due at least 90 days prior to the child's third birthday. The notification for the records selected was due between July 1st, 2021 and June 30th, 2022. These notifications are included in a monthly list the regional programs sen to the SMU and the Part C Data Manager then sends to the Part B Manager. All (7) seven EI programs in Puerto Rico were included in the data collection activities which takes place every year from July to September. The SMU uses child count data that regional programs submit to produce a list of records that fall within the inclusion criterion for this indicator. Based on the population, the sample size is calculated using the web-based tool, OpenEpi and, a list of random numbers is created using the random numbers module of the same tool. Records are chosen matching the number from the list of random numbers to the record from the list. For all regional programs, data were collected through monitoring activities conducted by the SMU at the regional and at the State Office. The Part C Data Manager reviews the list prior to sending it to the Part B Data Manager no later than the 15th day of every month. This constitutes the SEA/LEA notification for the territory to confirm timely notification to SEA/LEA. If the toddler's information was included in the list as required, the SMU concludes that notification to Part B was timely. After the on-site data collection is made, the SMU performs the analysis and, if necessary, phone calls with the regional supervisors are scheduled with the purpose of asking for additional information. These activities, the findings, and the importance of the process are explained to the regional supervisors, as the SMU does with other compliance indicators.

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

YES

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

YES

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

State monitoring

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

Puerto Rico Part C does not select EIS programs for monitoring. All (7) seven EI programs in Puerto Rico were included for the monitoring and data collection activities which take place every year from July to September.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

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

**FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

In the case of indicator 8B, regional supervisors are responsible for implementing strategies to avoid delays in notifying the SEA/LEA of the possible eligibility of the child for Part B services. For the current reporting period, after Puerto Rico received its determination letter, the SMU developed local determination letters that informed the regional programs of the findings of non-compliance identified in monitoring activities. When findings of non-compliance were identified, the SMU requested the regional programs to develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) in which the details of the findings, strategies to be implemented, the expectations from the regional program regarding implementation of the regulatory requirements, the resources, and the timeline to completion are included. These are also topics of discussion held in the supervisor's monthly meetings and other direct technical assistance activities.  
  
We reviewed updated data by convenience sampling during subsequent monitoring activities held by the state office in order to ensure that the regional programs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements related to timely notification of the child's potential eligibility for Part B services. The monitoring activities were conducted only for the centers that had findings of non-compliance during the previous year. When the SMU finds no further findings of noncompliance, the SMU concluded that the program is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. When findings of noncompliance persisted, the SMU scheduled follow-up visits to review more records and provided technical assistance to the regional supervisor and other personnel.  
  
During FFY 2020, the SMU identified seven (7) findings of non-compliance in four (4) regional programs. The state office reviewed updated data using the monthly list that is sent to the SEA/LEA, and that review reflected no additional findings of non-compliance. Therefore, based on that review, the state concluded that it achieved 100% compliance with the regulatory requirements.   
  
Although the jurisdiction did not meet the target for this indicator, the number of findings of non-compliance has decreased for FFY 2021 when compared to FFY 2020.

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

The SMU verified that each individual case of the seven (7) cases of noncompliance identified were corrected as all seven children are no longer part of the jurisdiction. These individual cases were thoroughly discussed with the supervisors of the regional programs that were the sources of findings of non-compliance and were included in the regional determinations. The regional supervisors implemented or strengthened strategies in order to ensure timely notification. The SMU verified through record review in monitoring activities, that all 7 findings of non-compliance reported in FFY 2020 were corrected within one year. In these cases, the children are no longer in the jurisdiction of the regional program, thus these cases were classified as corrected.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 8B - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because Puerto Rico reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, they must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Puerto Rico must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, Puerto Rico must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.   
  
If Puerto Rico did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why they did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

The SMU reviewed updated data by convenience sampling during subsequent monitoring activities held by the state office in order to ensure that the regional programs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements related to timely notification of the child's potential eligibility for Part B services. The monitoring activities were conducted only for the centers that had findings of non-compliance during the previous year. When the SMU finds no further findings of noncompliance, the SMU concluded that the program is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. When findings of noncompliance persisted, the SMU scheduled follow-up visits to review more records and provided technical assistance to the regional supervisor and other personnel.  
  
During FFY 2020, the SMU identified seven (7) findings of non-compliance in four (4) regional programs. The state office reviewed updated data using the monthly list that is sent to the SEA/LEA, and that review reflected no additional findings of non-compliance. Therefore, based on that review, the state concluded that it achieved 100% compliance with the regulatory requirements. The SMU verified that each individual case was corrected as all seven children are no longer part of the jurisdiction. That is the reason the jurisdiction did not identify findings of noncompliance.

## 8B - OSEP Response

## 8B - Required Actions

Because Puerto Rico reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, Puerto Rico must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator.   
  
When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Puerto Rico must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 SPP/APR, Puerto Rico must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If Puerto Rico did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why Puerto Rico did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

# Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

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

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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 | 64.20% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 96.03% | 95.90% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

| **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 95 | 96 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

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

**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

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

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

State monitoring

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

The PREIP includes all regional programs in the monitoring activities for this indicator. The Supervision and Monitoring Unit selected the records for the evaluation of Indicator 8C according to the transition conference's date recorded in the EI Data System. The criterion for the file selection for this indicator is toddlers whose third birthday was between September 29th, 2021 and September 28th, 2022, that were determined potentially eligible for Part B services and for whom a transition conference was required to be held at least 90 days prior the child's third birthday. The records selected were due to have the transition conference between July 1st, 2021 and June 30th, 2022. All (7) seven EI programs in Puerto Rico were included for data collection which takes place every year from July to September after the fiscal year ends. The SMU uses child count data that regional programs submit to the state office to produce a list of records that fall within the inclusion criterion for this indicator. A random numbers list is generated based on a sample size calculated using a web tool, OpenEpi. The tool's random numbers module creates a list of random numbers. Each record on the list has an assigned number starting from 1. Records that are monitored are chosen matching the number from the list of random numbers to the number assigned to the record from the child count report. For all regional programs, data were collected through on-site monitoring activities conducted by the SMU, explaining all the processes and their importance to the regional supervisors as education and corrective action processes take place. After the on-site data collection is made, the SMU performs the analysis and, if necessary, calls the regional supervisors for further information and clarifications. Documented exceptional family circumstances that prevented a timely transition conference are included in the numerator and denominator to calculate the data.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **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 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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

# Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

YES

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

Puerto Rico has Part B due process procedures adopted.

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

## 9 - Required Actions

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

# Indicator 10: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

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

NO

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/02/2022 | 2.1 Mediations held | 0 |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/02/2022 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 0 |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/02/2022 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 0 |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Puerto Rico State Interagency Coordination Council (PRSICC) is the group that brings together the main PREIP stakeholders. The group is composed of representatives of the Puerto Rico University Center of Excellence on Developmental Disabilities (UPR UCEDD/LEND), the Families and Children’s Affairs Administration, the Association of Parents of Children with Disabilities (APNI), the Health Services Administration, the Mental Health Services Administration, the Health Insurance Commissioner, Centro Margarita (Service Community-Based Organization), NY Foundling, the Office of the Ombudsman for Persons with Disabilities, SER de Puerto Rico (Service Community-Based Organization), Medicaid, the Department of Education, the State Head Start/Early Head Start Collaboration Office, and the Army Educational & Developmental Intervention Services (EDIS). It is important to note that in FFY 2019 some positions became vacant, but the PREIP will continue its efforts to recruit new members to ensure a broad representation of the program's stakeholders. During FFY 2021-2022, the SICC worked together in 4 meetings to provide input on issues regarding personnel development, SSIP, and compliance with IDEA requirements, and to continue discussing relevant information and data to select targets for compliance and results indicators for FFY 2020-2025. The SICC held its FFY 2021 meetings on September 2021, November 2021, January 2022, and April 2022. This meeting was convened to discuss new data and context around indicators 5 and 6 targets and baselines. New data, information, and scenarios were presented by the State Office to reach new agreements. All conversations held with the ICC are centered on data collected by the SMU, scientific literature, and the group's experience, so the decision-making process of the Program is widely informed. The SICC also provides feedback about the State Determination issued by OSEP and discusses recommendations for new strategies to improve all Programs’ areas as needed.  
  
In the January 2023 SICC meeting, the state office team presented the data regarding the 2023 SPP/APR submission and it was approved. Discussions were mostly around indicator 3 data, a higher number of referrals of children with autism in the EDIS Fort Buchanan (military base), the effect on child outcomes data, and the next steps to continue discussing the strategies and activities that have been selected by the state. One parent member was discussing her experiences receiving early intervention services and was interested in how these are reflected in the data and help improve child outcomes. Other members discussed the purpose of Part C services and how essential family engagement is in improving child outcomes.   
  
During FFY 2022, the PREIP expects to have new members, including new parents, and add representation of the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Program.

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target>= |  |  |  |  | 100.00% |
| Data |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 100.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

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

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

Puerto Rico reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2021. Puerto Rico is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

## 10 - Required Actions

# Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

***Targets:*** In its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the five years from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. The State’s FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State’s baseline data.

***Updated Data:*** In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 1, 2023 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families. In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

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

*Phase I: Analysis*:

- Data Analysis;

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

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

- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and

- Theory of Action.

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

- Infrastructure Development;

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

- Evaluation.

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

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

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

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

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

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

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

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State’s last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2022). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023).

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

C. Stakeholder Engagement

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

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

## 11 - Indicator Data

**Section A: Data Analysis**

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

After thorough infrastructure analysis presented in the SSIP phase I, a SiMR was selected for Puerto Rico: (Outcome B1) Children will show a higher rate of improvement in the acquisition of knowledge and skills and exhibit a level of functioning closer to same-aged peers upon exiting the program. The data that were reviewed supported this selection, which represents the territory’s main focus for implementing strategies to yield better child outcomes. Three strands of action have been selected to achieve this goal: Personnel/Workforce, Family Engagement, and Monitoring and Accountability. Activities aligned with these strands should allow the Program to achieve the short and long-term outcomes included in the theory of action and meet the target for the SiMR through the years. Puerto Rico has not changed the SiMR in the past year and has continued to work towards the intended goals.

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

NO

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

NO

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

NO

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

The theory of action was revised in 2016 to prioritize activities in 3 strands of action that will improve child outcomes. The resources included in this logic model are the Puerto Rico Department of Health and the State Office team, which is comprised of the Part C Coordinator, the Program Evaluator, the Data Manager, the Consultant in Developmental Pediatrics, and the new Operations Coordinator. The program also has as other resources. the personnel on the seven (7) regional programs, such as the supervisors, service coordinators and service providers, nurses, and data entry personnel. Other important groups are the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), OSEP, and TA providers. Last but certainly not least, the PREIP has its sources of funding, which include federal and state funds, and most recently ARP funds. The strands of action that the program is focusing on are personnel development/assessment practices, monitoring and accountability, and family engagement. The state believes that if the Program hires highly qualified professionals, conducts a needs assessment of professional competencies, and develops a program of ongoing professional development for services providers (that offers comprehensive knowledge of child development and skills to perform functional-authentic assessments and the use of recommended and evidence-based early intervention practices), then, service providers will have the knowledge and skills to effectively promote child development and functional, participation-based outcomes through family centered interventions in natural environments. Also, if the state establishes standard procedures and the use of appropriate instruments for initial and continuous assessment of children, the developmental level and needs of children will be better assessed and incorporated into the IFSP. Under the monitoring and accountability strand, the state believes that if the program implements a monitoring system of provider performance, fidelity of implementation of services, use of recommended practices, and monitoring of individual and family outcomes, the state will be able to identify individual quality of services and correct deficiencies through further training. Finally, under the family engagement strand, if the state’ develops strategies and procedures to increase family involvement in the implementation of the IFSP and the provision of a general stimulating environment for their children, children will be raised in a richer environment that promotes early learning and healthy development in all developmental aspects/outcomes. The mentioned activities will yield said short and intermediate outcomes, which will help the Program reach its overarching goal, which is that children in EIP will show a higher rate of improvement in the acquisition of knowledge and skills and exhibit a level of functioning closer to same aged peers upon exiting the Program.

Progress toward the SiMR

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

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

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2011 | 32.50% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= | 46.70% | 46.71% | 46.72% | 46.73% | 46.74% |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Children who entered the program below age expectations and improve functioning to a level nearer or comparable to same-aged peers | Children who did not improve functioning, improved but not sufficient to move nearer to same-aged peers , improve to be nearer to same-aged peers and improved to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 938 | 1,481 | 58.55% | 46.70% | 63.34% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.**

Puerto Rico used COS data as the source data to report progress on the SiMR for FFY 2021. Regional programs collect and submit the data to the Supervision and Monitoring Unit (SMU) every quarter of the year. The SMU then reviews and analyzes the data in order to evaluate implemented strategies for data collection, regional program performance, and child outcomes. The data are also presented to the ICC for discussion to support the Program's decision-making process.

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

Data for the SiMR is collected in every Regional Program and submitted on a quarterly basis to the SMU. Service providers collect COS data at the time of entry and exit of the child by filling out the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF). Regional nurses review the data and compare the forms to other relevant record information, such as progress notes. If nurses encounter discrepancies, further conversations are held with the service providers to make corrections, if necessary. The data is then transferred to an Excel sheet that shows the progress of every child that was determined eligible, had an active IFSP and exited the Program at any given month during the reporting period. The SMU collects all the data by regional program, checks for quality issues, and performs the analyses. Finally, the data are used to engage in discussions with stakeholders, draw conclusions and make decisions regarding the SiMR and other Program components. Puerto Rico uses the ECTA COS Calculator to support data analysis for this indicator. The numerator includes infants and toddlers that represent OSEP's progress categories "c" and "d". On the other hand, the denominator consists of infants and toddlers that represent OSEP's progress categories "a" through "d". This process constitutes the data analysis for this indicator.

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

NO

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

NO

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

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

**Please provide a link to the State’s current evaluation plan.**

Puerto Rico has been conducting activities to implement the evidence-based practice for several years. However, as it is widely known, Puerto Rico has suffered events in the past five (5) years that have hindered the territory's ability to fully implement all activities as initially intended and evaluate results. While coaching is the focus of the services, meaning that service providers use coaching when visiting homes, this has not been implemented uniformly. It has been included in training sessions, such as those related to the new eligibility and assessment tool, but the opportunity to fully implement the practice and collect evaluation data has been delayed. The territory has also been focusing on the work of changing the eligibility and assessment tool in the past months. Therefore, Puerto Rico has intentions of maintaining the evaluation plan originally designed in phase II. The priorities selected to work as action strands in this phase, continue to be the focus of the Program. The only change in the plan is the program's dates to achieve the goals. No other changes have been made to the evaluation plan in FFY 2021.  
  
The evaluation plan is divided into two main parts: the evaluation of the improvement strategy implementation and the evaluation of intended outcomes. The evaluation of the improvement strategy implementation is itself divided into 3 parts: the performance indicator (how will we know the activity happened according to the plan?), the data collection methods, and the timeline. The state identified 8 main activities as performance indicators, each with its process of collecting data for measurement and the associated date of initiation and completion. The 8 identified activities are: 1) a formal comprehensive system of personnel development is in place consistent with best practices recommendations, 2) screening and assessment tools for developmental delays were identified and adopted for use in the EIP, 3) more families are actively participating in EIP processes, 4) a more active collaboration between the PR PTIC and EIP is in place, 5) families communicated their opinions on how to participate more actively in EIP process, 6) COS periodic reports are available to improve service provision, 7) a formal protocol on the monitoring process and chart organization is available in the EIP, and 8) the EIP has a final version of a monitoring and evaluation procedures manual. To certify that we have achieved our goals, the program needs to develop and collect the following: a formal CSPD plan for EIP is implemented, and personnel development schedules, calendars, activities attendance lists, screening and assessment tools implemented/training records on developmental screening tools, number of children receiving developmental screening by assessment or screening tool, participant evaluations of their participation/ results of family surveys and focus groups, formal collaboration agreement/activities sponsored by the two agencies, participation logs in family activities, needs assessment report/family survey, focus groups by region, COS Reports/Improvement rates, COS calculation results, a protocol developed / results of the monitoring process performed, data from the local determination letters, monitoring and evaluation manual, implementation logs of monitoring procedures, results from the monitoring process.

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

NO

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

While still dealing with the pandemic and the barriers the program encountered, the jurisdiction managed to take steps toward the implementation of activities aligned with broad improvement strategies under the SSIP strands of action. First, Puerto Rico has been focusing on improving its infrastructure by implementing activities regarding workforce training, which is part of the strengthening of the CSPD. The main focus of the workforce training is the new eligibility and assessment tool. Identifying the new eligibility and assessment tool was included as an essential activity of this strand since phase II. During the past fiscal year, a proposal from the PRUCEDD was accepted. During FFY 2021 activities surrounding this improvement strategy started. Activities aligned with the change in the tool, such as implementation in two regional programs and process evaluation activities were expected to be conducted through the year 2022. These will now be conducted during FFY 2022 continuing on FFY 2023. The program focused on receiving necessary comprehensive technical assistance before implementation, therefore these activities are delayed. The technical assistance included conversations around the use of the AEPS in the determination of eligibility and assessment processes and discussions regarding the jurisdiction's definition of developmental delay. CSPD strategies also include training sessions regarding identification, services, and best practices for infants and toddlers with specific medical diagnoses. While in FFY 2020, the Puerto Rico Deaf-blind Project offered a webinar regarding this subject to EIP personnel, in FFY 2021, webinars related to identifying and referring children with autism were offered. FFY 2022 will see other activities in this strand of action such as continued training around the AEPS before full implementation, training around child development, and COS data, and collaborations with other programs of the DoH such as with the Lead Exposure Surveillance System.   
  
Regarding the Family Engagement strand, during FFY 2020, the PREIP hired a new Family Liaison that was to lead all improvement activities associated with this area. While he was part of the state office team, he participated in two activities aimed at educating families and other potential sources of referrals about early intervention services. He was invited to talk about early intervention services in PR at a local news station and in a show for parents with children and youth with disabilities that goes live through social media. Nevertheless, the Family Liaison is no longer within the Program. Therefore, the Program has started conversations with the PR Family-to-Family Center to establish collaborations for them to lead this strand of action. Through activities and webinars aimed at empowering families and including parents in all the program's activities from planning to service provision, and the decision-making process, families will be more engaged and this will help improve child outcomes. This strand will continue to be strengthened during FFY 2022 and 2023. The state office has also continued strengthening the relationship with the PTIC which has resulted in identifying families interested in becoming parent members of the SICC. This is another activity that has been included in the SSIP phase II.  
  
The activities in the monitoring and accountability strand of action, include the development of a manual that will guide the service coordinators and providers in the implementation of the new eligibility and assessment tool. Also, technical assistance received from TA centers and conversations with other states helped in the development of a request for proposals for a data system. This RFP was published in FFY 2022 and it is expected that the data system will be implemented in early FFY 2023.

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

Puerto Rico has seen short-term outcomes from the activities that have been conducted. Providing the AEPS training sessions to the personnel means the jurisdiction is closer to adopting this new tool. The practical sessions included in the training plan were to take place in FFY 2021, in preparation for starting with the pilot project in two regional programs. However, the need to receive targeted technical assistance around this activity delayed these practical sessions, and therefore, the initiation of the pilot in the two selected regional programs. These will now take place in FFY 2022. This activity will be formally evaluated to guide full implementation. The evaluation plan and its activities will be conducted by the Programmatic Management Unit of the Auxiliary Secretariat of Family Health, Integrated Services, and Health Promotion of the Puerto Rico Department of Health. This unit is comprised of program evaluations, data analysts, health educators, and other professionals with relevant expertise to support the PREIP with these activities. After full implementation, children will be more precisely assessed and data quality will improve. The change in the tool will also help guide service providers to develop and plan for the strategies shared in their visits, which will improve services that will lead to improved outcomes.   
  
Conversations and TA that started in FFY 2020 had as an outcome that a request for proposal started to be developed in FFY 2021, which will allow for a vendor selection in FFY 2022 for the design and implementation of a new data system set for early FFY 2023. A robust data system will support data collection procedures and will help implement strategies to monitor data quality. This will also help us identify areas of need for training and monitor compliance.   
  
The Family Engagement strand saw some changes. Conversations with the PR Family-to-Family Center to lead this strand had started. A proposal was submitted for the EIP's consideration. Activities such as webinars for families and the general community are planned for this strand. Appointing new parent members in the SICC is also an intended outcome for this strand. The State Office Team has started conversations during FFY 2021 to identify these families through the regional programs and through a collaboration with the PTIC.

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

NO

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

Regarding the personnel development/assessment practices, theoretical training sessions for the new eligibility and assessment tool were held in FFY 2021. Practical sessions are to be conducted in FFY 2022. A process and outcomes evaluation plan will be developed by the Programmatic Management Unit of the PRDoH. This will guide a pilot program in two regional programs to replicate the effort island-wide. The new tool should be fully implemented in early FFY 2023. This strand will also see continuing activities such as webinars for personnel around services, and evidence-based practices in services for example, in specific populations such as children with autism in FFY 2021 and children with lead exposure in FFY 2022. This will be in collaboration with the PRDoH Lead Exposure Surveillance System. It is also expected to coordinate a Home Visiting Summit in collaboration with the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program (MIECHV) in Puerto Rico. This will be aimed at providing training sessions for the personnel of both programs around different topics from child development to family engagement and other topics regarding home visiting. A number of families will also be included in this activity.  
  
In relation to the family engagement strand, webinars, and other activities, such as the development and distribution of new educational material are expected to be conducted in FFY 2022 by the PR Family-to-Family Center. These are aimed at strengthening family engagement in early intervention services, as well as educating potential referral sources for the early identification of children. The purpose of collaborating with the PRF2F is twofold since it also supports the jurisdiction's child find efforts.  
  
Other steps will be taken to strengthen family engagement, such as the recruitment of new parents for the SICC to ensure family representation and participation and all the program’s processes. The formal processes of appointing new parent members with take place in FFY 2022. Also, parent sessions will be held as a part of the evaluation of the implementation of the new assessment and eligibility tool. This will allow the Program to explore firsthand the family’s perspective of the new eligibility and assessment procedures in the territory.   
  
The monitoring and accountability strand will also see some other activities. The development of the Evaluation and Procedures Manual remains a priority. This will also include a Manual on evaluation for eligibility and assessment implementation and evaluation process. This also supports the workforce/personnel strand. In order to reach the goal of changing the data system, An RFP was developed in FFY 2021 and published following the jurisdictions protocols in FFY 2022. When a vendor is chosen, the system will be designed and implemented. Training sessions regarding the new system will be held to obtain all the benefits that the new system’s capabilities have.

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

During this reporting period, the PREIP has focused on conducting activities related to the change in the eligibility and assessment tool, processes regarding a new data system, addressing personnel shortages, and supporting service provision while still dealing with the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. Coaching is the evidence-based practice that has been adopted by the jurisdiction. The PREIP has included sessions on the topic in some of the training sessions related to the new eligibility tool. The program took this opportunity to continue training our personnel on this practice as our scientific/academic partner, the PRUCEDD was in charge of these sessions. Nevertheless, it has not been established island-wide and has not been a formal process of implementation and evaluation due to the need of prioritizing some projects over others. However, the Program will continue to take steps toward implementing the practice after these projects are fully implemented. This was originally projected for FFY 2021, but the state team office strongly believes that the change in the eligibility tool, adopting of a new data system, and addressing personnel shortages, will help prepare the Program for the implementation of the evidence-based practice. It is now expected to resume activities toward implementing this practice during FFY 2023. Activities will include receiving specific technical assistance from TA centers, selecting and hiring coaches, and designing training sessions.

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

Puerto Rico has selected coaching as the evidence-based practice to support improvement in child outcomes, especially in outcome B- SS1 (SiMR). This is the practice that service providers employ while visiting homes and providing services. Nevertheless, Puerto Rico has had some challenges in fully implementing the practice. Coaching was selected back in FFY 2016 and was intended to be implemented in conjunction with a primary service provider approach. In order to achieve this objective, various training sessions for the personnel, including service providers and coordinators, were conducted. It is known that Puerto Rico has suffered a few events, such as hurricanes and earthquakes which delayed the implementation of the efforts mentioned. During each event, Puerto Rico’s leadership had to adjust plans accordingly, to satisfy emergent needs and be able to continue to provide services. FFY 2020 has not been the exception as within a few months staff began to deal with the COVID-19 pandemic. Training sessions for new eligibility and assessment tool not only were delayed, but they had to be adjusted to be provided virtually. It is important to point out that these sessions include coaching as part of the topics that be covered. This had the purpose of continuing to pave the way to fully implementing and evaluating the strategy.  
  
FFY 2021 was the year that the Program intended to resume important projects that were delayed. Challenges still presented during this year, such as personnel shortages. Other projects were prioritized over the implementation of evidence-based practice to strengthen the program. The PREIP intends to resume the implementation of coaching as the evidence-based practice after the implementation of the new eligibility tool and the new data system.

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

Puerto Rico intends to implement coaching to provide an evidence-based practice to enhance parents’ and caregivers’ ability/capacity to support parents and caregivers to support their infants and toddlers to develop and learn, according to IDEA regulations. The jurisdiction has a vision of a more transdisciplinary approach, later combining coaching with the primary service provider approach. This change in the Program will help provide higher-quality services that will support the improvement of child outcomes. As support is provided to parents through coaching, family outcomes should also improve.

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

The Supervision and Monitoring Unit will collect data to monitor the fidelity of the implementation of the practice and evaluate results. As stated before, the jurisdiction has taken steps to implement the practice, but these efforts have been delayed. Nevertheless, the SMU will review fidelity tools to collect valid and reliable data to assess the implementation procedures and support changes, if necessary. These will be included in the Manual that will be developed by the SMU and the evaluation plan. These efforts are expected to be implemented with the collaboration of the Programmatic Management Unit, the team of professionals also collaborating with the EIP regarding the process evaluation of the AEPS implementation.

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

Qualitative data on the focus that Service Providers have when visiting homes has shown that it is highly effective to support families. However, valid and reliable quantitative data will be collected parallel to implementation to make informed decisions on the practice.

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

Although essential for our work and improving child outcomes, coaching as the jurisdiction's evidence-based practice will be starting to be implemented after the change in the eligibility tool and the new data system. The PREIP is anticipating work around this in FFY 2023. This will be done by selecting the coaches that will also help in the designing, planning, implementation, and evaluation phases. The SMU will evaluate the tool to assess the fidelity of implementation and an evaluation plan will be developed. This will help assess the impact on the SiMR and support decisions on the practice and its implementation. Conversations to provide further training on coaching should be held with our scientific partner, the PR University Center on Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research and Service (PRUCEDD). Puerto Rico will also start technical assistance around coaching with the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA), and the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy).

**Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.**

Because the PREIP was dealing with challenges encountered due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and other concerns like personnel shortages and was also receiving critical technical assistance to support implementing the new eligibility and assessment tool, some activities originally planned for this reporting period were delayed. Puerto Rico’s main focus for the next fiscal year will be to continue conducting the activities to achieve full implementation and evaluate all efforts. The data collected will provide robust information to make decisions about SSIP modifications, if necessary.

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

Description of Stakeholder Input

The Puerto Rico State Interagency Coordination Council (PRSICC) is the group that brings together the main PREIP stakeholders. The group is composed of representatives of the Puerto Rico University Center of Excellence on Developmental Disabilities (UPR UCEDD/LEND), the Families and Children’s Affairs Administration, the Association of Parents of Children with Disabilities (APNI), the Health Services Administration, the Mental Health Services Administration, the Health Insurance Commissioner, Centro Margarita (Service Community-Based Organization), NY Foundling, the Office of the Ombudsman for Persons with Disabilities, SER de Puerto Rico (Service Community-Based Organization), Medicaid, the Department of Education, the State Head Start/Early Head Start Collaboration Office, and the Army Educational & Developmental Intervention Services (EDIS). It is important to note that in FFY 2019 some positions became vacant, but the PREIP will continue its efforts to recruit new members to ensure a broad representation of the program's stakeholders. During FFY 2021-2022, the SICC worked together in 4 meetings to provide input on issues regarding personnel development, SSIP, and compliance with IDEA requirements, and to continue discussing relevant information and data to select targets for compliance and results indicators for FFY 2020-2025. The SICC held its FFY 2021 meetings on September 2021, November 2021, January 2022, and April 2022. This meeting was convened to discuss new data and context around indicators 5 and 6 targets and baselines. New data, information, and scenarios were presented by the State Office to reach new agreements. All conversations held with the ICC are centered on data collected by the SMU, scientific literature, and the group's experience, so the decision-making process of the Program is widely informed. The SICC also provides feedback about the State Determination issued by OSEP and discusses recommendations for new strategies to improve all Programs’ areas as needed.  
  
In the January 2023 SICC meeting, the state office team presented the data regarding the 2023 SPP/APR submission and it was approved. Discussions were mostly around indicator 3 data, a higher number of referrals of children with autism in the EDIS Fort Buchanan (military base), the effect on child outcomes data, and the next steps to continue discussing the strategies and activities that have been selected by the state. One parent member was discussing her experiences receiving early intervention services and was interested in how these are reflected in the data and help improve child outcomes. Other members discussed the purpose of Part C services and how essential family engagement is in improving child outcomes.   
  
During FFY 2022, the PREIP expects to have new members, including new parents, and add representation of the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Program.

Stakeholder input was collected through virtual meetings during the year. This is a continued effort coming from FFY 2020. The State Office team divided essential topics to be discussed in each meeting in order to facilitate the conversations. These conversations were held by presenting data relevant to the topic in the agenda, such as 618 data, referral by source, compliance and results indicators by regional program. This holds the purpose of making informed decisions for the program, the infants, and the toddlers served. Members participated by sharing their knowledge and experiences in their own agencies/organizations, and discussing data that was presented. These conversations led to agreements that give guidance to practices and activities.

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

The SMU would conduct relevant data analyses to guide discussions with the SICC members. An agenda with the topics to be discussed and minutes of the previous meeting are shared. In the meetings, discussions were divided by indicators, key strategies, or activities to facilitate active participation. The group has been meeting via Zoom since the start of the pandemic, so the SMU always prepares PowerPoint presentations with tables, graphics, and thorough explanations of scenarios or the data presented. Presentations have spaces for comments and questions right after each topic is presented; there is also space for further comments at the end of the presentations. If members ask for data that have not been presented, discussion regarding the utility and viability of doing so is conducted, an agreement is reached, and the SMU conducts the analysis to be presented in the next meeting. ICC members are also welcome to share educational materials or any other information they feel helps the Program’s purposes.

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

NO

**Additional Implementation Activities**

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

Coaching will take place after the implementation of the new eligibility tool and new data system. The Program has the intention of starting the coaching implementation by selecting the coaches and starting training sessions. Implementation and evaluation of the EBP as originally intended and collection fidelity of implementation data. The Program will engage in TA sessions with ECTA Center, DaSy Center, the PR UCEDD, the Programmatic Management Unit, and the SICC for this purpose

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

These activities are set to start in FFY 2023. Data collection methods include fidelity of implementation tools, meetings with coaches, evaluation data of the new tool training sessions, and COS data, among others that may be identified in later conversations. The data will guide the process and evaluation. All these activities are directed to improve child outcomes.

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

Some of the barriers identified by the territory are provider shortages. It has been reported in previous fiscal years that the number of providers was decreasing. This situation has worsened with the COVID-19 pandemic. Other providers continue to provide Part C services but have also shifted to provide services elsewhere, such as private clinics. This is a new situation that has been observed during the pandemic. This barrier has put a strain on providers that continue to be part of the PREIP personnel, especially when the number of referrals has increased after a decrease observed during the pandemic. The jurisdiction has had active conversations with the entities that are contracted by the PRDoH with the objective of exploring barriers to recruiting and retaining personnel. Many have expressed that they see a lower number of professionals on the Island. The Program intends to continue having these conversations with the corporations and implement strategies with their input. In FFY 2022, the PREIP started a process of hiring service providers with direct contracts with the Department. The state team has noticed less turnover of personnel that have direct contracts with the agency compared to those hired under private entities.

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

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Puerto Rico must provide the required numerator and denominator descriptions within the data table in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

The numerator is: Children who entered the program below age expectations and improve functioning to a level nearer or comparable to same-aged peers.  
The denominator is: Children who did not improve functioning, improved but not sufficient to move nearer to same-aged peers, improve to be nearer to same-aged peers and improved to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers

## 11 - OSEP Response

## 11 - Required Actions

# Certification

**Instructions**

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

**Certify**

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

**Select the certifier’s role**

Designated Lead Agency Director

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

**Name:**

Manuel I. Vargas Bernal, MD, MPH

**Title:**

Maternal, Child and Adolescent Health Division Director

**Email:**

mivargas@salud.pr.gov

**Phone:**

787-765-2929 ext. 4583

**Submitted on:**

04/25/23 1:17:22 PM

# Determination Enclosures

## RDA Matrix

**Puerto Rico**

2023 Part C Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

**Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination[[1]](#footnote-2)**

| **Percentage (%)** | **Determination** |
| --- | --- |
| 81.25% | Meets Requirements |

**Results and Compliance Overall Scoring**

|  | **Total Points Available** | **Points Earned** | **Score (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Results** | 8 | 5 | 62.50% |
| **Compliance** | 14 | 14 | 100.00% |

**2023 Part C Results Matrix**

**I. Data Quality**

**(a) Data Completeness: The percent of children included in your State’s 2021 Outcomes Data (Indicator C3)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number of Children Reported in Indicator C3 (i.e., outcome data) | 1,593 |
| Number of Children Reported Exiting in 618 Data (i.e., 618 exiting data) | 2,281 |
| Percentage of Children Exiting who are Included in Outcome Data (%) | 69.84 |
| **Data Completeness Score[[2]](#footnote-3)** | 2 |

**(b) Data Anomalies: Anomalies in your State’s FFY 2021 Outcomes Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data Anomalies Score**[[3]](#footnote-4) | 1 |

**II. Child Performance**

**(a) Data Comparison: Comparing your State’s 2021 Outcomes Data to other States’ 2021 Outcomes Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data Comparison Score[[4]](#footnote-5)** | 1 |

**(b) Performance Change Over Time: Comparing your State’s FFY 2021 data to your State’s FFY 2020 data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Performance Change Score[[5]](#footnote-6)** | 1 |

| **Summary Statement Performance** | **Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS1 (%)** | **Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS2 (%)** | **Outcome B: Knowledge  and Skills SS1 (%)** | **Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS2 (%)** | **Outcome C: Actions to Meet Needs  SS1 (%)** | **Outcome C: Actions to Meet Needs SS2 (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY 2021** | 48.01% | 77.21% | 63.34% | 42.88% | 45.11% | 69.99% |
| **FFY 2020** | 43.09% | 75.81% | 58.55% | 41.73% | 43.75% | 69.57% |

**2023 Part C Compliance Matrix**

| **Part C Compliance Indicator[[6]](#footnote-7)** | **Performance (%)** | **Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 1: Timely service provision** | 97.90% | N/A | 2 |
| **Indicator 7: 45-day timeline** | 100.00% | N/A | 2 |
| **Indicator 8A: Timely transition plan** | 100.00% | N/A | 2 |
| **Indicator 8B: Transition notification** | 97.89% | YES | 2 |
| **Indicator 8C: Timely transition conference** | 100.00% | N/A | 2 |
| **Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data** | 100.00% |  | 2 |
| **Timely State Complaint Decisions** | N/A |  | N/A |
| **Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions** | N/A |  | N/A |
| **Longstanding Noncompliance** |  |  | 2 |
| **Specific Conditions** | None |  |  |
| **Uncorrected identified noncompliance** | None |  |  |

**Appendix A**

**I. (a) Data Completeness:**

**The Percent of Children Included in your State's 2021 Outcomes Data (Indicator C3)**

Data completeness was calculated using the total number of Part C children who were included in your State’s FFY 2021 Outcomes Data (C3) and the total number of children your State reported in its FFY 2021 IDEA Section 618 data. A percentage for your State was computed by dividing the number of children reported in your State’s Indicator C3 data by the number of children your State reported exited during FFY 2021 in the State’s FFY 2021 IDEA Section 618 Exit Data.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data Completeness Score** | **Percent of Part C Children included in Outcomes Data (C3) and 618 Data** |
| **0** | **Lower than 34%** |
| **1** | **34% through 64%** |
| **2** | **65% and above** |

**Appendix B**

**I. (b) Data Quality:**

**Anomalies in Your State's FFY 2021 Outcomes Data**

This score represents a summary of the data anomalies in the FFY 2021 Indicator 3 Outcomes Data reported by your State. Publicly available data for the preceding four years reported by and across all States for each of 15 progress categories under Indicator 3 (in the FFY 2017 – FFY 2020 APRs) were used to determine an expected range of responses for each progress category under Outcomes A, B, and C. For each of the 15 progress categories, a mean was calculated using the publicly available data and a lower and upper scoring percentage was set 1 standard deviation above and below the mean for category a, and 2 standard deviations above and below the mean for categories b through e[[7]](#footnote-8)[[8]](#footnote-9). In any case where the low scoring percentage set from 1 or 2 standard deviations below the mean resulted in a negative number, the low scoring percentage is equal to 0.

If your State's FFY 2021 data reported in a progress category fell below the calculated "low percentage" or above the "high percentage" for that progress category for all States, the data in that particular category are statistically improbable outliers and considered an anomaly for that progress category. If your State’s data in a particular progress category was identified as an anomaly, the State received a 0 for that category. A percentage that is equal to or between the low percentage and high percentage for each progress category received 1 point. A State could receive a total number of points between 0 and 15. Thus, a point total of 0 indicates that all 15 progress categories contained data anomalies and a point total of 15 indicates that there were no data anomalies in all 15 progress categories in the State's data. An overall data anomaly score of 0, 1, or 2 is based on the total points awarded.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outcome A** | **Positive Social Relationships** |
| **Outcome B** | **Knowledge and Skills** |
| **Outcome C** | **Actions to Meet Needs** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Category a** | **Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning** |
| **Category b** | **Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers** |
| **Category c** | **Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it** |
| **Category d** | **Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers** |
| **Category e** | **Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers** |

**Expected Range of Responses for Each Outcome and Category, FFY 2021**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome\Category** | **Mean** | **StDev** | **-1SD** | **+1SD** |
| **Outcome A\Category a** | 1.43 | 1.62 | -0.19 | 3.05 |
| **Outcome B\Category a** | 1.26 | 2.27 | -1.01 | 3.53 |
| **Outcome C\Category a** | 1.14 | 1.59 | -0.45 | 2.73 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome\Category** | **Mean** | **StDev** | **-2SD** | **+2SD** |
| **Outcome A\ Category b** | 23.62 | 8.94 | 5.75 | 41.49 |
| **Outcome A\ Category c** | 20.32 | 12.69 | -5.05 | 45.69 |
| **Outcome A\ Category d** | 27.33 | 9.46 | 8.42 | 46.24 |
| **Outcome A\ Category e** | 27.3 | 15.11 | -2.92 | 57.52 |
| **Outcome B\ Category b** | 25.16 | 9.76 | 5.65 | 44.68 |
| **Outcome B\ Category c** | 28.73 | 12.11 | 4.5 | 52.95 |
| **Outcome B\ Category d** | 31.76 | 8.06 | 15.64 | 47.87 |
| **Outcome B\ Category e** | 13.09 | 8.56 | -4.02 | 30.21 |
| **Outcome C\ Category b** | 20.27 | 8.49 | 3.29 | 37.26 |
| **Outcome C\ Category c** | 23.01 | 13.08 | -3.16 | 49.17 |
| **Outcome C\ Category d** | 34.09 | 8.09 | 17.9 | 50.28 |
| **Outcome C\ Category e** | 21.49 | 15.06 | -8.62 | 51.6 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data Anomalies Score** | **Total Points Received in All Progress Areas** |
| 0 | 0 through 9 points |
| 1 | 10 through 12 points |
| 2 | 13 through 15 points |

**Anomalies in Your State’s Outcomes Data FFY 2021**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Number of Infants and Toddlers with IFSP’s Assessed in your State** | **1,593** |

| **Outcome A — Positive Social Relationships** | **Category a** | **Category b** | **Category c** | **Category d** | **Category e** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **State Performance** | 31 | 269 | 63 | 214 | 1,016 |
| **Performance (%)** | 1.95% | 16.89% | 3.95% | 13.43% | 63.78% |
| **Scores** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

| **Outcome B — Knowledge and Skills** | **Category a** | **Category b** | **Category c** | **Category d** | **Category e** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **State Performance** | 15 | 528 | 367 | 571 | 112 |
| **Performance (%)** | 0.94% | 33.15% | 23.04% | 35.84% | 7.03% |
| **Scores** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

| **Outcome C — Actions to Meet Needs** | **Category a** | **Category b** | **Category c** | **Category d** | **Category e** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **State Performance** | 33 | 360 | 85 | 238 | 877 |
| **Performance (%)** | 2.07% | 22.60% | 5.34% | 14.94% | 55.05% |
| **Scores** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

|  | **Total Score** |
| --- | --- |
| **Outcome A** | 4 |
| **Outcome B** | 5 |
| **Outcome C** | 3 |
| **Outcomes A-C** | 12 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data Anomalies Score** | 1 |

**Appendix C**

**II. (a) Data Comparison:**

**Comparing Your State’s 2021 Outcomes Data to Other States’ 2021 Outcome Data**

This score represents how your State's FFY 2021 Outcomes data compares to other States' FFY 2021 Outcomes Data. Your State received a score for the distribution of the 6 Summary Statements for your State compared to the distribution of the 6 Summary Statements in all other States. The 10th and 90th percentile for each of the 6 Summary Statements was identified and used to assign points to performance outcome data for each Summary Statement[[9]](#footnote-10). Each Summary Statement outcome was assigned 0, 1, or 2 points. If your State's Summary Statement value fell at or below the 10th percentile, that Summary Statement was assigned 0 points. If your State's Summary Statement value fell between the 10th and 90th percentile, the Summary Statement was assigned 1 point, and if your State's Summary Statement value fell at or above the 90th percentile the Summary Statement was assigned 2 points. The points were added up across the 6 Summary Statements. A State can receive a total number of points between 0 and 12, with 0 points indicating all 6 Summary Statement values were at or below the 10th percentile and 12 points indicating all 6 Summary Statements were at or above the 90th percentile. An overall comparison Summary Statement score of 0, 1, or 2 was based on the total points awarded.

*Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited 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.*

*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.*

**Scoring Percentages for the 10th and 90th Percentile for Each Outcome and Summary Statement, FFY 2021**

| **Percentiles** | **Outcome A SS1** | **Outcome A SS2** | **Outcome B SS1** | **Outcome B SS2** | **Outcome C SS1** | **Outcome C SS2** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **10** | 43.42% | 36.60% | 54.62% | 29.02% | 55.14% | 36.15% |
| **90** | 82.74% | 69.30% | 79.34% | 55.52% | 85.72% | 76.15% |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data Comparison Score** | **Total Points Received Across SS1 and SS2** |
| **0** | 0 through 4 points |
| **1** | 5 through 8 points |
| **2** | 9 through 12 points |

**Your State’s Summary Statement Performance FFY 2021**

| **Summary Statement (SS)** | **Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS1** | **Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS2** | **Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS1** | **Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS2** | **Outcome C: Actions to meet needs SS1** | **Outcome C: Actions to meet needs SS2** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Performance (%)** | 48.01% | 77.21% | 63.34% | 42.88% | 45.11% | 69.99% |
| **Points** | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Total Points Across SS1 and SS2(\*)** | 6 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Your State’s Data Comparison Score** | 1 |

**Appendix D**

**II. (b) Performance Change Over Time:**

**Comparing your State’s FFY 2021 data to your State’s FFY 2020 data**

The Summary Statement percentages in each Outcomes Area from the previous year’s reporting (FFY 2020) is compared to the current year (FFY 2021) using the test of proportional difference to determine whether there is a statistically significant (or meaningful) growth or decline in child achievement based upon a significance level of p<=.05. The data in each Outcome Area is assigned a value of 0 if there was a statistically significant decrease from one year to the next, a value of 1 if there was no significant change, and a value of 2 if there was a statistically significant increase across the years. The scores from all 6 Outcome Areas are totaled, resulting in a score from 0 – 12. The Overall Performance Change Score for this results element of ‘0’, ‘1’, or ‘2’ for each State is based on the total points awarded. Where OSEP has approved a State’s reestablishment of its Indicator C3 Outcome Area baseline data the State received a score of ‘N/A’ for this element.

**Test of Proportional Difference Calculation Overview**

The summary statement percentages from the previous year’s reporting were compared to the current year using an accepted formula (test of proportional difference) to determine whether the difference between the two percentages is statistically significant (or meaningful), based upon a significance level of p<=.05. The statistical test has several steps.

Step 1: Compute the difference between the FFY 2021 and FFY 2020 summary statements.

e.g., C3A FFY2021% - C3A FFY2020% = Difference in proportions

Step 2: Compute the standard error of the difference in proportions using the following formula which takes into account the value of the summary statement from both years and the number of children that the summary statement is based on[[10]](#footnote-11)

Sqrt[([FFY2021% \* (1-FFY2021%)] / FFY2021N) + ([FFY2022% \* (1-FFY2022%)] / FFY2022N)] = Standard Error of Difference in Proportions

Step 3: The difference in proportions is then divided by the standard error of the difference to compute a z score.

Difference in proportions /standard error of the difference in proportions = z score

Step 4: The statistical significance of the z score is located within a table and the *p* value is determined.

Step 5: The difference in proportions is coded as statistically significant if the *p* value is it is less than or equal to .05.

Step 6: Information about the statistical significance of the change and the direction of the change are combined to arrive at a score for the summary statement using the following criteria

0 = statistically significant decrease from FFY 2020 to FFY 2021

1 = No statistically significant change

2= statistically significant increase from FFY 2020 to FFY 2021

Step 7: The score for each summary statement and outcome is summed to create a total score with a minimum of 0 and a maximum of 12. The score for the test of proportional difference is assigned a score for the Indicator 3 Overall Performance Change Score based on the following cut points:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator 3 Overall Performance Change Score** | **Cut Points for Change Over Time in Summary Statements Total Score** |
| **0** | Lowest score through 3 |
| **1** | 4 through 7 |
| **2** | 8 through highest |

| **Summary Statement/ Child Outcome** | **FFY 2020 N** | **FFY 2020 Summary Statement (%)** | **FFY 2021 N** | **FFY 2021 Summary Statement (%)** | **Difference between Percentages (%)** | **Std Error** | **z value** | **p-value** | **p<=.05** | **Score: 0 = significant decrease; 1 = no significant change; 2 = significant increase** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SS1/Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships** | 752 | 43.09% | 577 | 48.01% | 4.92 | 0.0275 | 1.7869 | 0.074 | NO | 1 |
| **SS1/Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills** | 1,964 | 58.55% | 1,481 | 63.34% | 4.78 | 0.0167 | 2.8557 | 0.0043 | YES | 2 |
| **SS1/Outcome C: Actions to meet needs** | 976 | 43.75% | 716 | 45.11% | 1.36 | 0.0245 | 0.5569 | 0.5776 | NO | 1 |
| **SS2/Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships** | 2,133 | 75.81% | 1,593 | 77.21% | 1.40 | 0.0140 | 1.0018 | 0.3164 | NO | 1 |
| **SS2/Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills** | 2,133 | 41.73% | 1,593 | 42.88% | 1.15 | 0.0164 | 0.7027 | 0.4822 | NO | 1 |
| **SS2/Outcome C: Actions to meet needs** | 2,133 | 69.57% | 1,593 | 69.99% | 0.42 | 0.0152 | 0.2765 | 0.7821 | NO | 1 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Total Points Across SS1 and SS2** | **7** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Your State’s Performance Change Score** | **1** |

## Data Rubric

**Puerto Rico**

**FFY 2021 APR**[[11]](#footnote-12)

|  | **Part C Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data** |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **APR Indicator** | **Valid and Reliable** | **Total** |
| **1** | 1 | 1 |
| **2** | 1 | 1 |
| **3** | 1 | 1 |
| **4** | 1 | 1 |
| **5** | 1 | 1 |
| **6** | 1 | 1 |
| **7** | 1 | 1 |
| **8A** | 1 | 1 |
| **8B** | 1 | 1 |
| **8C** | 1 | 1 |
| **9** | N/A | 0 |
| **10** | 1 | 1 |
| **11** | 1 | 1 |
|  | **Subtotal** | 12 |
| **APR Score Calculation** | **Timely Submission Points** - If the FFY 2021 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right. | 5 |
|  | **Grand Total** - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) = | 17 |

|  |  | **618 Data[[12]](#footnote-13)** |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table** | **Timely** | **Complete Data** | **Passed Edit Check** | **Total** |
| **Child Count/Settings Due Date: 4/6/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Exiting Due Date: 11/2/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/2/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
|  |  |  | **Subtotal** | 9 |
| **618 Score Calculation** |  |  | **Grand Total** (Subtotal X 2) = | 18.00 |

| **Indicator Calculation** |  |
| --- | --- |
| A. APR Grand Total | 17 |
| B. 618 Grand Total | 18.00 |
| C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) = | 35.00 |
| Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator | 1 |
| Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator | 0.00 |
| **Denominator** | 35.00 |
| D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator\*) = | 1.0000 |
| E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) = | 100.00 |

**\*Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 2.**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data**

**DATE: February 2023 Submission**

**SPP/APR Data**

**1) Valid and Reliable Data** - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

**Part C 618 Data**

**1) Timely** – A State will receive one point if it submits counts/ responses for an entire EMAPS survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **618 Data Collection** | **EMAPS Survey** | **Due Date** |
| Part C Child Count and Setting | Part C Child Count and Settings in EMAPS | 1st Wednesday in April |
| Part C Exiting | Part C Exiting Collection in EMAPS | 1st Wednesday in November |
| Part C Dispute Resolution | Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS | 1st Wednesday in November |

**2) Complete Data** – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all data elements, subtotals, totals as well as responses to all questions associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

**3) Passed Edit Check –** A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection. See the EMAPS User Guide for each of the Part C 618 Data Collections for a list of edit checks (available at: <https://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/edfacts/index.html>).

## Dispute Resolution



## How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP’s IDEA Website.  How the Department Made Determinations in 2023 will be posted in June 2023. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

[https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/](https://nam10.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fsites.ed.gov%2Fidea%2Fhow-the-department-made-determinations%2F&data=05%7C01%7Cdan.royal%40aemcorp.com%7C56561a053eed4e4dffea08db4cd0ea7f%7C7a41925ef6974f7cbec30470887ac752%7C0%7C0%7C638188232405320922%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=REJfNg%2BRs0Gk73rS2KzO2SIVRCUhHLglGd6vbm9wEwc%3D&reserved=0)

1. For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2023: Part C." [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Please see Appendix A for a detailed description of this calculation. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Please see Appendix B for a detailed description of this calculation. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Please see Appendix C for a detailed description of this calculation. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Please see Appendix D for a detailed description of this calculation. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part C SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2023_Part-C_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Numbers shown as rounded for display purposes. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Values based on data for States with summary statement denominator greater than 199 exiters. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. Values based on data for States with summary statement denominator greater than 199 exiters. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. Numbers shown as rounded for display purposes. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a ‘0’. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 2 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)