

MS Part C

FFY2016 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

Executive Summary:

The Mississippi State Department of Health (MSDH) is the lead agency responsible for administering Part C of IDEA, known as the Mississippi First Steps Early Intervention Program (MSFSEIP). The MSDH has organized the State's 82 counties into nine public health districts, each of which operates a District FSEIP responsible for ensure all eligible infants and toddlers and their families receive early intervention services. The MSFSEIP has further organized the nine District FSEIPs into three regions comprised of three District EIPs each. The MSFSEIP provides general supervision and technical assistance to each of the nine District FSEIPs as well as opportunities for professional development for early interventionists across the state. Stakeholders are engaged in multiple workgroups providing feedback on systemic improvement efforts as well as general advice on program administration. The MSFSEIP works with the District FSEIPs to collect and report data in a timely manner.

During FFY2016, the MSFSEIP continued to adjust leadership and staffing at the State and District level. The MSFSEIP and District FSEIPs engaged in ongoing implementation of systematic improvement efforts. The State experienced slippage in Indicators 1 (Timely Services), 2 (Natural Environments), and 3 [A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2] (Child Outcomes). Several District FSEIPs had findings of noncompliance that the State was able to verify as corrected within one year; however, one District FSEIP had an ongoing finding of noncompliance in Indicator 1 (Timely Services) that has not yet been verified as corrected. The MSFSEIP is continuing to refine its general supervision model and differentiated technical assistance supports to ensure improved compliance and improved outcomes for children and families.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
ms_sicc 2018.pdf	Miranda Richardson	1/31/2018 5:36 PM	

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 MSFSEIP has implemented a general supervision system that includes universal, focused, and targeted monitoring approaches to ensure each District FSEIP implements all Federal regulations and State policies and procedures for Part C of IDEA. The MSFSEIP monitors District FSEIPs using a combination of methods including annual self-assessments, annual fiscal audits, triannual onsite visits, data reviews (i.e., reviews of data in the Child Registry), desk audits (i.e, reviews of paper records), interviews, observations, and issues identified during dispute resolutions, as applicable.

The MSFSEIP has a Monitoring Coordinator and assigns additional State staff to assist with conducting monitoring reviews, desk audits, interviews, observations, and onsite visits. In addition, each region has an assigned Quality Technical Assistant who provides ongoing technical assistance to address specific concerns identified in the District FSEIP (see TA Section below). These supports are intended to assist District FSEIP staff with identifying the root cause(s) of noncompliance within the FSEIP and ensure timely correction of noncompliance. The MSFSEIP takes enforcement actions, as appropriate, against any District FSEIP that fails to correct noncompliance in a timely manner.

The MSFSEIP is developing a more robust and responsive general supervision model to incorporate universal, focused, and targeted TA with the State's general supervision efforts.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Technical Assistance System:

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

The MSFSEIP provides ongoing technical assistance by identifying District FSEIP needs and providing general, focused, and targeted TA to District FSEIP and service providers. The MSFSEIP identify District FSEIP training needs by conducting annual surveys of training needs, periodic data analyses, QTA reports, and specific requests for TA. General TA is provided by MSFSEIP staff through monthly conference calls and quarterly district meetings. Focused and targeted TA are provided by MSFSEIP staff via phone and email or onsite visits and by regional QTAs using a variety of methods, as needed, including onsite visits, observation and feedback sessions, coaching, assisted preliminary desk audits, conference calls, and video-conferences. QTAs periodically accompany Service Coordinators and Providers on home visits to offer guidance and support during comprehensive evaluations, Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) meetings, and service delivery. QTAs periodically work with Service Coordinators to review paper records and data quality in the electronic Child Registry. In addition, the QTAs provide ongoing technical assistance to address specific concerns identified as a result of monitoring the District FSEIPs. QTAs work with District and Service Coordinators to identify root cause(s) of noncompliance and to develop strategies and activities for any District-developed Corrective Action Plans (CAPs) and Improvement Plans (IPs). QTAs also support all District FSEIP staff in implementing CAPs and IPs with fidelity and documenting evidence of change.

The MSFSEIP has a Monitoring and TA Director who oversees the Monitoring Coordinator and field-based QTAs. The Monitoring and TA Director works with national experts on implementing train-the-trainer models of TA service delivery. The MSFSEIP Monitoring and TA Director and Part C Coordinator ensure QTAs receive quality professional development and offer supervision and guidance on early intervention best practices via monthly meetings and reviews of monthly reports. The MSFSEIP State personnel and QTAs have participated in national professional conferences and in TA opportunities provided through OSEP TA Centers. In addition, they engage in ongoing professional development via webinars and Professional Learning Communities (PLCs).

The MSFSEIP is developing a more robust technical assistance model to include universal, focused, and targeted TA to better aligns with the State's general supervision efforts. The TA system is preparing local coaches to support implementation of evidence-based practices in addition to supports offered by the assigned regional QTA.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

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 MSFSEIP has provided annual training to District FSEIP staff and providers on Federal regulations and State policies and procedures. In addition, the MSFSEIP has provided District trainings on referral procedures, data system maintenance and record keeping procedures, family rights, transition, timely services, evaluation and eligibility determination, working with families of children who are deaf/hard of hearing, and routines-based model implementation.

As a part of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), the MSFSEIP's reconstituted Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) Leadership Team continued revisions of personnel standards and development of orientation and credentialing procedures for early intervention personnel with support from national experts, OSEP-funded TA Centers, and other State Part C programs. The expanded CSPD Leadership Team supported the MSFSEIP's ability to develop new partnerships to expand professional development opportunities. All training under development includes three levels of support: knowledge development, skill development, and knowledge and skill application. Knowledge development is provided through online training modules and self-study with integrated assessments. Skill development is provided through real-time online or face-to-face training with integrated application exercises. Knowledge and skill application is provided via field-based observation and on-the-job coaching. The progress of all MSFSEIP and District FSEIP staff and providers will be tracked through these levels of learning experiences. This new approach to professional development will ensure service providers have the knowledge and skills to provide services effectively to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The MSFSEIP has begun implementing these CSPD initiatives as part of the Phase III of the SSIP.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part C results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

The MSFSEIP has multiple avenues to engage stakeholders in advising the program. The State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) including SSIP Stakeholders meet quarterly for a public meeting and more frequently for workgroup activities. The SICC is comprised of service providers, Head Start representatives, MDE-OSE representative, parents, Institute of Higher Learning (IHL) and University representatives, Medicaid representatives, parent advocacy groups, and other community leaders.

On November 14, 2014, the SICC assisted the MSFSEIP in setting the FFY2014 APR targets for Indicators 2, 3, and 4:

- Indicator 2: Natural Environment target to set to remain at 95%.
- Indicator 3: Child Outcomes: Summary Statement 1 for Outcomes A - C targets were set to remain at 85%. The Summary Statement 2 for Outcomes A - C targets were set at 63%.
- Indicator 4: Family Survey targets were set at 92%.

On February 13, 2015, the SICC assisted the MSFSEIP in setting the FFY2014 APR targets for Indicators 5 and 6:

- Indicator 5: Child Find 0-1 target was set at 0.61%.
- Indicator 6: Child Find 0-3 target was set at 1.72%.

In both meetings, the SICC reviewed historical targets and performance data trends for Mississippi and national averages. The Stakeholders discussed emerging issues in the MSFSEIP and assisted in setting "ambitious but realistic" targets for the MSFSEIP for the next six-year grant cycle.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2015 performance of each EIS Program or Provider 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 2015 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2015 APR in 2017, is available.

The MSFSEIP shared the complete APR at its SICC/SSIP Stakeholder Meeting as well as a results summary page. The MSFSEIP discussed the results by Indicator and answered all public questions posed. The performance of each District FSEIP was disaggregated and shared at subsequent SICC meetings providing comparison relative to the MSFSEIP targets. The MSFSEIP also publishes seven years of APR data on the MSDH website (http://msdh.ms.gov/msdhsite/_static/41,0,74,63.html). The website also provides information (i.e., phone and email contact information) to submit comments about the SPP/APR.

Attachments

3/14/2019

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

File Name

Uploaded By

Uploaded Date

No APR attachments found.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

OSEP Response

States were instructed to submit Phase III Year Two of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) by April 2, 2018. The State provided the required information.

In the FFY 2017 APR, the State must report FFY data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 2, 2018); and (3) a summary of the infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR.

Required Actions

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 1: Timely provision of services

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)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		76.00%	77.00%	76.00%	78.00%	76.00%	87.00%	95.00%	96.00%	94.19%	90.67%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	90.23%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
1415	1841	90.23%	100%	86.80%

Reasons for Slippage

One District FSEIP had difficulties engaging service providers to provide sufficient services between January to April 2017. Another District FSEIP continues to experience ongoing challenges engaging sufficient service providers since FFY 2013.

<p>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.</p>	183
---	-----

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). Mississippi First Steps Early Intervention Program's criteria for "timely" receipt of services is defined as receiving all early intervention services identified on the IFSP no later than 30 business after written parental consent for services.

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

- State monitoring
- State database

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

July 1, 2016 - June 30, 2017

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

This report includes the complete data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs covering the entire reporting period from July 1, 2016-June, 30 2017.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

3/14/2019

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	null	1	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The MSFSEIP verified correction of non-compliance through record reviews. The MSFSEIP conducted a record audit of an entire month or a minimum of 10 cases, whichever is greater, after the completion of corrective action plan activities from each District FSEIP with findings to verify compliance of Timely Provision of Services.

Based on these reviews, the one District FSEIP (District 1) was found in compliance with correctly implementing the 30-day timeline for Timely Provision of Services.

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

The MSFSEIP verified that each District FSEIP corrected each individual case of noncompliance (although services were late) by reviewing and ensuring that a "start date of service" was entered in the Child Registry and that services were started by reviewing proper documentation of each individual paper record of initial start date of services, provider's name and contact information, and documentation of progress notes (if available).

FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

One District FSEIP (District 5) has not yet reached a compliance of 100% to clear findings for Timely Services. This District FSEIP has been placed under Intensive TA to address specific root causes identified through a self assessment. The state has also sought national TA support to identify additional strategies to improve timely services, including participation in the Part C Peer Learning Group 2: Timeliness of Service—Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) (Indicator C1) and Service Delivery (Indicator C7). The state team will include the Local Program Coordinator for the District 5 FSEIP.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that the remaining uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 was corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 and each EIS program or provider with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2013: (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 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments**

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)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			94.00%	95.00%	96.00%	97.00%	98.00%	98.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Data		97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	91.00%	97.00%	97.00%	95.00%	94.00%	94.34%	93.22%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	95.00%
Data	91.30%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The EIP met with its SICC members on November 14, 2014 and set targets for the Natural Environment. Targets were set at 95% for the next 5 years. These targets are based on historical data and the State's capacity to serve children in the Natural Environment.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	1,752	
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	1,953	

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
1,752	1,953	91.30%	95.00%	89.71%

Reasons for Slippage

Due to shortages of service providers who are able to travel to the natural environments, District FSEIP programs have engaged providers who provides services in clinic settings to ensure services are available. The MSFSEIP personnel are working with the SICC and a Service Provider ad hoc committee to identify strategies to recruit and retain early intervention providers who can provide services in the national environment.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

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)

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)? No

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2013	Target ≥						76.00%	78.00%	78.00%	78.00%	84.69%	85.00%
		Data					76.00%	87.00%	90.00%	83.00%	88.00%	84.69%	83.74%
A2	2013	Target ≥						66.00%	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%	64.46%	65.00%
		Data					66.00%	70.00%	64.00%	65.00%	64.00%	64.46%	62.71%
B1	2013	Target ≥						82.00%	84.00%	84.00%	84.00%	84.18%	85.00%
		Data					82.00%	86.00%	88.00%	82.00%	86.00%	84.18%	80.80%
B2	2013	Target ≥						68.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	62.25%	63.00%
		Data					68.00%	69.00%	63.00%	66.00%	64.00%	62.65%	61.49%
C1	2013	Target ≥						84.00%	86.00%	86.00%	86.00%	84.25%	85.00%
		Data					84.00%	88.00%	89.00%	82.00%	86.00%	84.25%	83.99%
C2	2013	Target ≥						73.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	61.36%	63.00%
		Data					73.00%	72.00%	69.00%	65.00%	63.00%	61.36%	63.77%

	FFY	2015
A1	Target ≥	85.00%
	Data	79.05%
A2	Target ≥	65.00%
	Data	65.45%
B1	Target ≥	85.00%
	Data	81.05%
B2	Target ≥	63.00%
	Data	61.23%
C1	Target ≥	85.00%
	Data	83.67%
C2	Target ≥	63.00%
	Data	61.56%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Target A2 ≥	65.00%	65.00%	65.00%
Target B1 ≥	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Target B2 ≥	64.00%	64.50%	65.00%
Target C1 ≥	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Target C2 ≥	63.50%	64.00%	64.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The MS First Steps EIP met with its SICC members on November 14, 2014 and set targets. Targets for Summary Statement 1 for Outcomes A - C were set at 85% and Summary Statement 2 for Outcomes A - C were adjusted to 63%. These targets are based on the number of children that exited the program and were not meeting age expectation, the population of children with medical conditions that 3/14/2019

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

have a high probability of slowly progressing, target data of other states, and setting ambitious but realistic targets for the percentage of children who should exist Part C meeting age expectations according to the stakeholders.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	1058.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	20.00	1.89%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	144.00	13.61%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	243.00	22.97%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	331.00	31.29%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	320.00	30.25%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
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 $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	574.00	738.00	79.05%	85.00%	77.78%
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 $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	651.00	1058.00	65.45%	65.00%	61.53%

Reasons for A1 Slippage

Over the past two years the program has been implementing certain components of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that deals with child outcomes scoring. Also the program is increasing trainings to providers and encouraging all Service Coordinators to complete the DaSy online Child Outcomes Summary (COS) Process Module. Because of this the program expects the State's Child Outcomes data will fluctuate over the next two to three years as the Service Coordinators and providers increase their knowledge on the child outcomes ratings process.

Reasons for A2 Slippage

Over the past two years the program has been implementing certain components of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that deals with child outcomes scoring. Also the program is increasing trainings to providers and encouraging all Service Coordinators to complete the DaSy online Child Outcomes Summary (COS) Process Module. Because of this the program expects the State's Child Outcomes data will fluctuate over the next two to three years as the Service Coordinators and providers increase their knowledge on the child outcomes ratings process.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	21.00	1.98%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	157.00	14.84%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	275.00	25.99%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	353.00	33.36%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	252.00	23.82%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
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 $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	628.00	806.00	81.05%	85.00%	77.92%
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 $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	605.00	1058.00	61.23%	64.00%	57.18%

Reasons for B1 Slippage

Over the past two years the program has been implementing certain components of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that deals with child outcomes scoring. Also the program is increasing trainings to providers and encouraging all Service Coordinators to complete the DaSy online Child Outcomes Summary (COS) Process Module. Because of this the program expects the State's Child Outcomes data will fluctuate over the next two to three years as the Service Coordinators and providers increase their knowledge on the child outcomes ratings process.

Reasons for B2 Slippage

Over the past two years the program has been implementing certain components of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that deals with child outcomes scoring. Also the program is increasing trainings to providers and encouraging all Service Coordinators to complete the DaSy online Child Outcomes Summary (COS) Process Module. Because of this the program expects the State's Child Outcomes data will fluctuate over the next two to three years as the Service Coordinators and providers increase their knowledge on the child outcomes ratings process.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
to three years as the Service Coordinators and providers increase their knowledge on the child outcomes ratings process.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	18.00	1.70%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	141.00	13.33%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	296.00	27.98%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	373.00	35.26%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	230.00	21.74%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
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 $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	669.00	828.00	83.67%	85.00%	80.80%
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 $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	603.00	1058.00	61.56%	63.50%	56.99%

Reasons for C1 Slippage

Over the past two years the program has been implementing certain components of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that deals with child outcomes scoring. Also the program is increasing trainings to providers and encouraging all Service Coordinators to complete the DaSy online Child Outcomes Summary (COS) Process Module. Because of this the program expects the State's Child Outcomes data will fluctuate over the next two to three years as the Service Coordinators and providers increase their knowledge on the child outcomes ratings process.

Reasons for C2 Slippage

Over the past two years the program has been implementing certain components of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that deals with child outcomes scoring. Also the program is increasing trainings to providers and encouraging all Service Coordinators to complete the DaSy online Child Outcomes Summary (COS) Process Module. Because of this the program expects the State's Child Outcomes data will fluctuate over the next two to three years as the Service Coordinators and providers increase their knowledge on the child outcomes ratings process.

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

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	
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.	

Please note that this data about the number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program is optional in this FFY16 submission. It will be required in the FFY17 submission.

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? Yes

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

Each child's evaluation team, including the Service Coordinator and parent, uses assessment data collected at entry to determine child outcomes ratings using the **Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process**. At exit, the the child's IFSP team, including the Service Coordinator and parent, uses results of ongoing assessment data collected at exit to determine child outcomes ratings using the **Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process**.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

States must report the following data starting with the FFY 2017 SPP/APR submission, due February 2019: (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.

--

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

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)

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2006	Target ≥					89.00%	92.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	92.00%	92.00%
		Data			84.00%	84.00%	81.00%	83.00%	85.00%	92.00%	93.00%	88.25%	90.70%
B	2006	Target ≥					89.00%	92.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	92.00%	92.00%
		Data			87.00%	87.00%	84.00%	86.00%	88.00%	92.00%	96.00%	89.72%	92.87%
C	2006	Target ≥					90.00%	92.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	92.00%	92.00%
		Data			88.00%	88.00%	85.00%	89.00%	85.00%	89.00%	94.00%	88.25%	89.30%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	92.00%
	Data	86.84%
B	Target ≥	92.00%
	Data	87.80%
C	Target ≥	92.00%
	Data	86.63%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	92.00%	92.00%	92.00%
Target B ≥	92.00%	92.00%	92.00%
Target C ≥	92.00%	92.00%	92.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The MS First Steps EIP met with its SICC members on November 14, 2014 and targets were set for Family Involvement. Targets were set at 92% over the next 5 years based on historical performance and an understanding of the change implemented in how this indicator was rated. Targets were adjusted to account for improved parental understanding of their family rights and procedural safeguards, allowing families to understand and to provide ratings with increased accuracy on the family survey. In addition, the targets reflect the new methodology used to calculate these ratings. (For more information on the methodology use, see the comments under the FFY 2013 data.) The MS First Steps EIP also changed the process for calculating each of the indicators based on guidance from the ECO Center. Previous results used a representative item for each outcome; the FFY2013 data are based upon an average across all items loading on each outcome. This change formula caused percentages to be slightly higher than expected. The State is now utilizing the correct methodology to calculate the results and expect more accurate ratings on the family survey.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of families to whom surveys were distributed	1794.00
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	33.84% 607.00
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	536.00
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	600.00
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	544.00
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	598.00
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	538.00
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	596.00

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	86.84%	92.00%	89.33%
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	87.80%	92.00%	90.97%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	86.63%	92.00%	90.27%

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

The demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program. Yes

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

Surveys are sent out once a year and are hand-delivered to all families who participate in the MSFSEIP with a return envelope with pre-paid postage. The survey has an accompanying letter with contact information for assistance in completing the survey, including the state parent resource center, translation services, and tribal contacts. Three months after the distribution of the family surveys, Service Coordinators make follow-up contacts with families to encourage them to return their survey. The state office monitors the response rate and reports to District Coordinators if their district is underrepresented in the responses gathered. Surveys are collected over a six-month time frame to ensure ample time for participation.

In FFY 2016, a total of 607 responses were collected yielding a response rate of 33.84% of families in the MSFSEIP. Analyses were conducted to determine the representativeness of the responses. When disaggregated by race, the respondent groups *Black or African American* and *More than One Race* responded at rates higher than their percentage of the population; however, the response rates were not statistically different from the population of families in the MSFSEIP. *Asian* and *Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander* participants responded at rates approximately equal to their percentage of the population. *White* and *American Indian/Alaska Native* participants responded at rates lower than their percentage of the population; however, again, the response rates were not statistically different from the population of families in the MSFSEIP (see *Table 1*). When disaggregated by geographic location according to the public health districts (PHD), the respondent groups were not statistically different from the population of families for PHD 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9. PHD 5 was underrepresented (see *Table 2*).

Table 1: Response Disaggregated by Race

No

Mississippi	African American or Black	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	White	More than one race	Total
# families in target population	1098385	15030	25742	1187	1754684	2257	2967297
# families responded to survey	290	1	8	2	279	7	607
Target representation (% of families)	37%	1%	1%	0.04%	59%	0.08%	
Actual representation (% of families)	48%	0%	1%	0%	46%	1%	
Difference	11%	-.3%	.5%	0%	-13%	1.1%	Race Overall
Are your data representative?	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	

Mississippi	Hispanic Origin		Total
	Hispanic	Not Hispanic	
# families in target population	81481	2885816	2967297
# families responded to survey	19	588	607

Yes

Target representation (%)	3%	97%
----------------------------------	----	-----

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
of families)**

Actual representation (% of families) 3% 97%

Difference 0.4% -0.4% **Hispanic Overall**

Are your data representative? Yes Yes

Data source: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division. Release date: June, 2016

PHD	# of Families that Returned Survey by PHD	# of EI Families by PHD	% Returned Survey by PHD	Proportion Representative of Responses by PHD	% of EI Population by PHD	Mississippi Population by PHD*
PHD 1	148	247	59.92%	24.38%	13.76%	10.95%
PHD 2	58	190	30.53%	9.56%	10.96%	12.41%
PHD 3	78	143	54.55%	12.85%	8.78%	6.76%
PHD 4	29	157	26%	4.78%	10.25%	8.17%
PHD 5	32	258	12.4%	5.27%	13.65%	21.46%
PHD 6	64	151	42.38%	10.54%	9.08%	7.96%
PHD 7	50	112	44.4%	8.24%	9.84%	5.67%
PHD 8	50	133	27.32%	8.24%	10.55%	10.28%
PHD 9	98	353	27.76%	16.14%	16.44%	16.34%
Total	607	1794	33.84%	100%	100%	100%

* Data source: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division. Release date: June, 2016

The MSFSEIP is currently working on implementing several strategies to increase participation in the family survey. The MSFSEIP is working to make the survey available using multiple methods by supplementing the paper surveys with an online version. The MSFSEIP is working on resolving security and technical issues to be able to post a link to the family survey on the Lead Agency website enabln families to complete the survey online. The MSFSEIP is considering alternate timing points (e.g., scheduled IFSP meetings and family forums) to provide families additional opportunities for completing the survey when they may be more readily able and prepared to provide feedback.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			0.55%	0.60%	0.65%	0.70%	0.75%	0.75%	0.75%	0.60%	0.61%
Data		0.53%	0.50%	0.49%	0.66%	0.74%	0.86%	0.57%	0.53%	0.64%	0.62%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	0.62%
Data	0.57%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	0.63%	0.64%	0.65%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Indicator 5 data was not available to present to stakeholders during the November 14th meeting; therefore, State staff adjusted targets to reflect the change made to the eligibility criteria in 2011 (i.e., changed from 25% delay in one or more area to a 33% delay in one area and 25% delay in two or more areas). These targets were presented to the SICC at the meeting held on February 13, 2015. Based on the input provided by the stakeholders, these targets were accepted.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	243	null
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2016	6/22/2017	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	37,310	null
TBD			null	

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
243	37,310	0.57%	0.63%	0.65%

Compare your results to the national data

State	Number served birth to 1 year	Number served birth through 2 years	Number served 3 years to 4 years	Number served 4 years to 5 years	Number served 5 years or older	Percentage of population 1, birth through 2 years (%)	Birth through 2 years (cumulative count) - Race Ethnicity Total
Mississippi 3/14/2019	243	1,953	-	-	-	1.73	3,215

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			1.53%	1.68%	1.78%	1.88%	1.98%	1.98%	1.98%	1.70%	1.72%
Data		1.36%	1.21%	1.34%	1.56%	1.66%	1.88%	1.74%	1.65%	1.73%	1.69%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	1.74%
Data	1.72%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	1.76%	1.78%	1.80%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Indicator 6 data were not available to present to stakeholders during the November 14th meeting; therefore, State staff adjusted targets to reflect the change made to the eligibility criteria in 2011 (i.e., changed from 25% delay in one or more area to a 33% delay in one area and 25% delay in two or more areas). These targets were presented to the SICC at the meeting held on February 13, 2015. Based on the input provided by the stakeholders, these targets were accepted.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	1,953	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2016	6/22/2017	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	112,938	
TBD			null	

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
1,953	112,938	1.72%	1.76%	1.73%

Compare your results to the national data

State	Number served birth to 1 year	Number served birth through 2 years	Number served 3 years to 4 years	Number served 4 years to 5 years	Number served 5 years or older	Percentage of population ¹ , birth through 2 years (%)	Birth through 2 years (cumulative count) - Race Ethnicity Total
Mississippi	243	1,953	-	-	-	1.73	3,215
US and Outlying Areas	49,294	372,896	1,185	61	0	3.12	723,543

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 7: 45-day timeline**

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)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		88.00%	88.00%	93.00%	87.00%	92.00%	94.00%	96.00%	97.00%	96.81%	95.65%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	94.78%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
1,521	1,809	94.78%	100%	95.80%
Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>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.</i>				212

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

- State monitoring
- State database

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

July 1, 2016 - June 30, 2017

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

This report includes the complete data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs covering the entire reporting period from July 1, 2016-June, 30 2017.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	null	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The MSFSEIP verified correction of non-compliance through record reviews. The MSFSEIP conducted a record audit of an entire month or a minimum of 10 cases, whichever is greater, after the completion of corrective action plan activities from each District FSEIP with findings to verify compliance with the 45-Day Timeline.

Based on these reviews, the one District FSEIP (District 1) was found in compliance with correctly implementing the 45-day Timeline.

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

The MSFSEIP verified that each District FSEIP corrected each individual case of noncompliance (although late) by reviewing and ensuring that an IFSP was developed and entered in the Child Registry. The District FSEIP provided documentation of each individual paper record of evaluation and IFSP development.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 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 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

Required Actions

--

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition**

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)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		83.00%	90.00%	100%	87.00%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98.20%	98.49%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	93.58%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 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

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
978	1,043	93.58%	100%	97.32%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>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.</i>	37
--	----

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

State monitoring

State database

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

July 1, 2016-June 30, 2017

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

This report includes the complete data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs covering the entire reporting period from July 1, 2016-June, 30 2017.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	2	null	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The MSFSEIP verified correction of non-compliance through record reviews. The MSFSEIP conducted a record audit of an entire month or a minimum of 10 cases, whichever is greater, after the completion of corrective action plan activities from each District FSEIP with findings to verify compliance with Transition Steps and Services.

Based on these reviews, the two District FSEIPs (District 8 and 9) were found in compliance with implementing 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.

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

The MSFSEIP verified that each District FSEIP corrected each individual case of non-compliance or the child was no longer enrolled in the MSFSEIP. Documentation in the IFSP and Child Registry were reviewed.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 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 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition**

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)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		66.00%	91.00%	98.00%	96.00%	98.00%	100%	100%	100%	99.83%	99.33%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	97.62%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

- Yes
- No

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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
1,041	1,043	97.62%	100%	99.81%

<p>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.</p>	null
---	------

Describe the method used to collect these data

Data was collected in the State's Child Registry. The State's Data Manager analyzed the data entered by the Service Coordinators.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? No

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

- State monitoring
- State database

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

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

July 1, 2016 - June 30, 2017

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

This report includes the complete data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs covering the entire reporting period from July 1, 2016-June, 30 2017.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	null	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The MSFSEIP verified correction of non-compliance through record reviews. The MSFSEIP conducted a record audit of an entire month or a minimum of 10 cases, whichever is greater, after the completion of corrective action plan activities from each District FSEIP with findings to verify compliance with Notification of the SEA/LEA.

Based on these reviews, the one District FSEIP (District 9) was found in compliance with correctly notifying the SEA and LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddlers's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

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

The MSFSEIP verified that each District FSEIP corrected each individual case of noncompliance or the child was no longer enrolled in the MSFSEIP. Documentation in the IFSP and Child Registry were reviewed.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 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 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition**

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)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		45.00%	79.00%	68.00%	73.00%	79.00%	98.00%	100%	99.00%	94.42%	96.14%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	91.29%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 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

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
978	1,043	91.29%	100%	97.32%

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference <i>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.</i>	null
Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>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 at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	37

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

- State monitoring
- State database

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

July 1, 2016 - June 30, 2017

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

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

This report includes the complete data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs covering the entire reporting period from July 1, 2016-June, 30 2017.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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	null	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The MSFSEIP verified correction of non-compliance through record reviews. The MSFSEIP conducted a record audit of an entire month or a minimum of 10 cases, whichever is greater, after the completion of corrective action plan activities from each District FSEIP with findings to verify compliance with the Transition Conference.

Based on these reviews, the seven District FSEIPs (District 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9) were found in compliance with conducting the transition conference 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.

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

The MSFSEIP verified that District 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9 corrected each individual case of noncompliance or the child was no longer enrolled in the MSFSEIP. Documentation in the IFSP and Child Registry were reviewed.

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The MSFSEIP verified correction of non-compliance through record reviews. The MSFSEIP conducted a record audit of an entire month or a minimum of 10 cases, whichever is greater, after the completion of corrective action plan activities from each District FSEIP with findings to verify compliance with the Transition Conference.

Based on this review, one District FSEIP (District 5) were found in compliance with conducting the transition conference 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.

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

The MSFSEIP verified that District 5 corrected each individual case of noncompliance or the child was no longer enrolled in the MSFSEIP. Documentation in the IFSP and Child Registry were reviewed.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 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 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions**

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

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)

This indicator is not applicable.

OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable for the State.

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 10: Mediation**

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)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥											
Data											

FFY	2015
Target ≥	
Data	

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥			

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1 Mediations held	n	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	0			

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2016. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

--

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan**

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016
Target		63.00%	63.00%	64.00%
Data	63.60%	62.40%	63.20%	

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	64.50%	65.00%

Key:

Description of Measure

See attachment

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See attachment

Overview

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., EIS program and/or EIS provider, geographic region, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, etc.) As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

See attachment

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in EIS programs and/or EIS providers to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and other early learning initiatives, such as Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge and the Home Visiting program and describe the extent that these new initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

See attachment

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

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Analyses and must be a child- or family-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increase the rate of growth in infants and toddlers demonstrating positive social-emotional skills) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increase the percentage reported under child outcome B under Indicator 3 of the SPP/APR (knowledge and skills) and increase the percentage trend reported for families under Indicator 4 (helping their child develop and learn)).

Statement

See attachment

Description

See attachment

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families. The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support EIS program and/or EIS provider implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified result(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build EIS program and/or EIS provider capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

See attachment

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in EIS programs and/or EIS providers, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

See attachment

Infrastructure Development

- Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

see document

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

see document

Evaluation

- Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

see document

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

see document

Phase III submissions should include:

- Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
- Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
- Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SiMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

see attachment

B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

see attachment

C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SiMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SiMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

see attachment

D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SiMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

see attachment

E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SiMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SiMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SiMR in relation to targets

see attachment

F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

see attachment

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

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.

Selected: Designated by the Lead Agency Director to certify

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: Stacy Callender

Title: Part C Coordinator

Email: Stacy.Callender@msdh.ms.gov

Phone: 601-576-7427