

# MS Part C

# FFY2015 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 in Mississippi as the MS 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.

FFY2015 was a year of restructuring for the MSFSEIP as the State adjusted to new leadership and staffing at the State and District level as well as the new State accounting system. The MSFSEIP and District FSEIPs engaged in ongoing planning and began implementation of systematic improvement efforts. The State experienced slippage in Indicators 2, 3(A1, C2), 4 (A, B, C), and 8 (A, B, C). In addition, several District FSEIPs had findings of noncompliance not corrected within one year; however, the state was able to verify correction of noncompliance in all but one District FSEIP. 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 going forward.

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
<a href="#">mississippi part c 2017 icc form.pdf</a>	Miranda Richardson		<input type="button" value="R"/> e m o v e

**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, and data reviews (i.e., reviews of data in the Child Registry), desk audits (i.e, reviews of paper records), interviews, observations, and instances and findings from dispute resolutions as often as needed.

The MSFSEIP has reorganized staff roles to assign a staff member as the Monitoring Coordinator, assign additional State staff to assist with conducting monitoring reviews, and contracted with staff to assist with 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

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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 reorganized staff roles to assign a staff member as the Training Coordinator and is working with national experts on implementing train-the-trainer models of TA service delivery. The MSFSEIP Training Coordinator and Part C Coordinator ensure QTAs receive quality professional development and offer supervision and guidance on EI best practices via bimonthly conferences and reviews of monthly reports. The QTAs have participated in national professional conferences and in national TA opportunities the MSFSEIP has engaged. 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 that better aligns with the State's general supervision efforts. The TA system will implement local experts to complement the existing assigned regional TA to provide ongoing support for implementation of evidence-based practices.

Attachments			
	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 and regional trainings on Transition in the Spring 2015 in partnership with the Mississippi Department of Education's Office of Special Education (MDE-OSE) and on Care Coordination in May 2015 in partnership with MSDH Child & Adolescent Health Programs.

As a part of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), the MSFSEIP is redeveloping its Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD), including the reconstitution of the CSPD Advisory Committee, revising personnel standards, and implementing new orientation and credentialing procedures for early intervention personnel with support from national experts, TA Centers, and other State Part C programs. Revisions to the CSPD will enable the MSFSEIP to disseminate critical content on and support the implementation of evidence-based practices. All training is being developed to include three levels of content and experiences: basic, intermediate, and advanced. Basic training will use online training modules and self-study with integrated assessments to develop content knowledge. Intermediate training will use real-time online or face-to-face training with integrated application exercises to develop skills in applying content knowledge. Advanced training will consist of field-based observation and feedback to develop skills in real-world application. The progress of all MSFSEIP and District FSEIP staff and providers will be tracked through these levels of high-quality 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 will be 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%.

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

- 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 2014 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 2014 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 2014 APR in 2016, 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**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

**FFY 2015 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 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%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2015 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
1560	2007	90.67%	100%	90.23%

<p><b>Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances</b>  <i>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.</i></p>	251
--	-----

**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, 2015 - June 30, 2016

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

Data accurately reflects the data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs in the reporting period from July 1, 2015 - June 30, 2016.

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

none

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014**

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	null	0

**FFY 2014 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 10% or at a minimum 10 (which ever is greater) records from each District FSEIP to verify compliance of Timely Provision of Services.

Based on these reviews, the following District FSEIPs were found in compliance with correctly implementing the 30-day timeline for Timely Provision of Services: District 2, 4, 6, and 8.

*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 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 reviewed each District FSEIP's Corrective Action Plan for completion of activities and conducted a record audit of 10% or at a minimum 10 (which ever is greater) records from each District FSEIP to verify compliance of Timely Provision of Services.

Based on these reviews, the following District FSEIPs were found in compliance with correctly implementing the 30-day timeline for Timely Provision of Services: District 1, 3, 7 and 9. District 5 was found not to be in compliance with Prong II by 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*

The District 5 did not provide evidence of correction of Prong II of noncompliance for the Timely Provision of Services and received a state-issued individualized Corrective Action Plans (CAP) to address systemic issues leading to noncompliance. In addition, targeted TA is being provided to the District FSEIP to address specific concerns identified.

**FFY 2015 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%

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

**FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	95.00%	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 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings</a>	1,795	
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	<a href="#">Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs</a>	1,966	

**FFY 2015 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
1,795	1,966	93.22%	95.00%	91.30%

**Explanation of Slippage**

In FFY 2015, MSFSEIP saw a decrease in infants and toddlers being served in the Natural Environment. District FSEIPs have reported a shortage of providers who are willing to serve infants and toddlers in the home/community.

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

none

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response**

**FFY 2015 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%

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

**FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Target A2 ≥	65.00%	65.00%	65.00%	65.00%
Target B1 ≥	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Target B2 ≥	63.00%	64.00%	64.50%	65.00%
Target C1 ≥	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Target C2 ≥	63.00%	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 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 2015 SPP/APR Data**

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	1233.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
--	--------------------	------------------------



**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	24.00	1.95%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	153.00	12.41%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	249.00	20.19%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	419.00	33.98%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	388.00	31.47%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 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).	668.00	845.00	83.74%	85.00%	79.05%
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).	807.00	1233.00	62.71%	65.00%	65.45%

**Explanation of A1 Slippage**

Over the past several years the MSFSEIP has focused on improving data quality. Initially, high variability was noticed among the PHDs with results that may have underestimated as well as overestimated child performance. Subsequently, providers have received trainings focusing on understanding typical child development and the use of the decision tree process for providing ratings for children. As service providers have increased their knowledge of the rating process, the quality of the data has improved and become more stable; however due to the wider variability of ratings collected at entry, up to three years prior, compared to the more realistic and stable ratings collected at exit, the ability to accurately interpret the slippage/no slippage on results indicators is hampered.

**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	25.00	2.03%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	148.00	12.00%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	305.00	24.74%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	435.00	35.28%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	320.00	25.95%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 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).	740.00	913.00	80.80%	85.00%	81.05%
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).	755.00	1233.00	61.49%	63.00%	61.23%

**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	19.00	1.54%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	143.00	11.60%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	312.00	25.30%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	518.00	42.01%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	241.00	19.55%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 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).	830.00	992.00	83.99%	85.00%	83.67%
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).	759.00	1233.00	63.77%	63.00%	61.56%

**Explanation of C2 Slippage**

5/9/2017

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Over the past several years the MSFSEIP has focused on improving data quality. Initially, high variability was noticed among the PHDs with results that may have underestimated as well as overestimated child performance. Subsequently, providers have received trainings focusing on understanding typical child development and the use of the decision tree process for providing ratings for children. As service providers have increased their knowledge of the rating process, the quality of the data has improved and become more stable; however due to the wider variability of ratings collected at entry, up to three years prior, compared to the more realistic and stable ratings collected at exit, the ability to accurately interpret the slippage/no slippage on results indicators is hampered.

**Was sampling used?** No

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)?** Yes

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

none

**FFY 2015 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%

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

**FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	92.00%	92.00%	92.00%	92.00%
Target B ≥	92.00%	92.00%	92.00%	92.00%
Target C ≥	92.00%	92.00%	92.00%	92.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The MS First Steps EIP met with its SICCC 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 2015 SPP/APR Data**

Number of respondent families participating in Part C	1971.00
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	541.00
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	623.00
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	547.00
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	623.00
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	621.00

	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	90.70%	92.00%	86.84%

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	92.87%	92.00%	87.80%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	89.30%	92.00%	86.63%

**Explanation of A Slippage**

In FFY 2015, Service Coordinators were instructed to have a more hands off approach when delivering the surveys to the families. Service Coordinators were instructed to leave the survey with the family and have them to mail the survey back instead of the old approach of the families completing the survey and handing the survey back to Service Coordinators. This new approach has allowed families to accurately complete the survey with no pressure from the Service Coordinators.

**Explanation of B Slippage**

In FFY 2015, Service Coordinators were instructed to have a more hands off approach when delivering the surveys to the families. Service Coordinators were instructed to leave the survey with the family and have them to mail the survey back instead of the old approach of the families completing the survey and handing the survey back to Service Coordinators. This new approach has allowed families to accurately complete the survey with no pressure from the Service Coordinators.

**Explanation of C Slippage**

In FFY 2015, Service Coordinators were instructed to have a more hands off approach when delivering the surveys to the families. Service Coordinators were instructed to leave the survey with the family and have them to mail the survey back instead of the old approach of the families completing the survey and handing the survey back to Service Coordinators. This new approach has allowed families to accurately complete the survey with no pressure from the Service Coordinators.

**Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.**

Surveys 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. Due to low return rates for certain districts the state office resend 498 surveys to families who had not responded to the original survey.

In FFY2015, a total of 628 responses were collected yielding a response rate of 32% 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 White were not statistically different from the population of families in the MSFSEIP. Hawaii or Islander and More than Two were over represented and American Indian and Asian was underrepresented (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

Race	# of EI Families that Returned Survey by Race	# of EI Families by Race	% of EI Families who Returned Survey by Race	% of Total Response by Race	% of EI Population by Race	Mississippi Population by Race*
American Indian or Alaskan	2	9	22%	0.32%	0.46%	.486%
Asian	3	14	21%	0.48%	0.71%	.997%
Black or African American	282	883	32%	44.90%	44.80%	37.196%
Hawaii or Islander	2	2	100%	0.32%	0.10%	.036%

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Hispanic or Latino	28	65	43%	4.46%	3.30%	2.970%
Two or More Races	9	25	36%	1.43%	1.27%	1.060%
White	302	973	31%	48.09%	49.37%	57.255%
Total	628	1971	32%	100%	100%	100%

\* Data source: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division. Release date: June, 2015

Rate in grey are generated based on events less than 20 thus not stable.

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	107	206	52%	17.04%	10.45%	10.8%
PHD 2	69	216	32%	10.99%	10.96%	12.3%
PHD 3	71	173	41%	11.31%	8.78%	7.1%
PHD 4	52	202	26%	8.28%	10.25%	8.2%
PHD 5	41	269	15%	6.53%	13.65%	21.4%
PHD 6	100	179	56%	15.92%	9.08%	8.1%
PHD 7	39	194	20%	6.21%	9.84%	5.8%
PHD 8	68	208	33%	10.83%	10.55%	10.3%
PHD 9	81	324	25%	12.90%	16.44%	16.0%
Total	628	1971	32%	100%	100%	100%

\* Data source: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division. Release date: June, 2015

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State

No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

none

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response**

**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%

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

**FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	0.62%	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 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs</a>	216	null
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2015	6/30/2016	<a href="#">Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1</a>	38,173	null

**FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data**

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
216	38,173	0.62%	0.62%	0.57%

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

none

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response**

**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%

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

**FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	1.74%	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 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs</a>	1,966	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2015	6/30/2016	<a href="#">Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3</a>	114,596	

**FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data**

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
1,966	114,596	1.69%	1.74%	1.72%



**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

none

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response**

**FFY 2015 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%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2015 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
1,435	1,764	95.65%	100%	94.78%
<b>Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances</b> <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>				237

**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, 2015 - June 30, 2016

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

Data accurately reflects the data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs in the reporting period from July 1, 2014 - June 30, 2015.

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, **not including correction of findings**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014**

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

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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 2014 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 reviews of Correction of Non-Compliance/Correction Action Plans and record reviews. The MSFSEIP reviewed each District FSEIP's Correction of Non-Compliance/Correction Action Plans for completion of activities and conducted a record audit of 10% or at a minimum 10 (whichever is greater) records from each District FSEIP to verify compliance of the 45-Day Timeline.

Based on these reviews, all District FSEIPs that received a finding for FFY 2014 were 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.

**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 reviews of Correction Action Plans and record reviews. The MSFSEIP reviewed each District FSEIP's Correction Action Plans for completion of activities and conducted a record audit of 10% or at a minimum 10 (whichever is greater) records from each District FSEIP to verify compliance of the 45-Day Timeline.

Based on these reviews, District FSEIPs 8 and 9 were found to be 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.

**FFY 2015 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 SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

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

**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%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2015 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
992	1,091	98.49%	100%	93.58%

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>	29
--	----

**Explanation of Slippage**

District 3, 5, and 8 did not provide the state with sufficient justification on why transition steps and services was late or not conducted in the registry. District 4 had one service coordinator who retired before sufficiently documenting transition steps and services in the registry. The state is conducting Registry trainings in every District.

**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, 2015 - June 30, 2016

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

Data accurately reflects the data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs in the reporting period from July 1, 2015 - June 30, 2016.

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

none

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	0	0

**FFY 2014 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 10% or at a minimum 10 (which ever is greater) records from each District FSEIPs to verify compliance of Transition Steps and Services.

Based on these reviews, District 2, 3, 4, and 5 were found to be in compliance with correctly 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.

**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 reviews of Correction Action Plans and record reviews. The MSFSEIP reviewed each District FSEIP's Corrective Action for completion of activities and conducted a record audit of 10% or at a minimum 10 (which ever is greater) records from each District FSEIP to verify compliance of Transition Steps and Services.

Based on these reviews, Districts 8 and 9 were found to be in compliance with correctly implementing Transition Steps and 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 non-compliance or the child was no longer enrolled in the MSFSEIP. Documentation in the IFSP and Child Registry were reviewed.

**FFY 2015 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 SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

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

**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%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data**

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

- Yes
- No

Please explain

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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
1,065	1,091	99.33%	100%	97.62%

<p><b>Number of parents who opted out</b> 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
---	------

**Explanation of Slippage**

District 4 and 9 each had one service coordinator who did not sufficiently document if notification was sent to the SEA and the LEA.

**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

Is the policy on file with the Department? No

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

## FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

State monitoring

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

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, 2015 - June 30, 2016

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

Data accurately reflects the data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs in the reporting period from July 1, 2015 - June 30, 2016.

### Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, **not including correction of findings**

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

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

### FFY 2014 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 by conducting a record audit of 10% or at a minimum 10 (whichever is greater) records from the District FSEIP to verify compliance of Notification of the SEA/LEA.

Based on these reviews, the District 5 was found to be 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.

### 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 reviews of the Correction of Non-Compliance and record reviews. The MSFSEIP reviewed the District FSEIP Correction of Non-Compliance by conducted a record audit of 10% or at a minimum 10 (whichever is greater) records from the District FSEIP to verify compliance of Notification of the SEA/LEA.

Based on these reviews, the District 9 was found to be 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.

**FFY 2015 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 SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

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

**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%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2015 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

Please explain

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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
875	1,091	96.14%	100%	91.29%

<b>Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference</b> <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
<b>Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances</b> <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>	121

**Explanation of Slippage**

District 4 and 9 each had one service coordinator who did not sufficiently document in the toddlers record if the transition conference was held. District 8 did not provide sufficient documentation on why the transition conference was late or not conducted.

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

- State monitoring
- State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

5/9/2017



**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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, 2015 - June 30, 2016

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

Data accurately reflects the data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs in the reporting period from July 1, 2015 - June 30, 2016.

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

none

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014**

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 2014 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 10% or at a minimum 10 (whichever is greater) records from District FSEIP to verify compliance of Transition Conference.

Based on the record reviews, District 3 was 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 3 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 reviews of Correction Action Plans and record reviews. The MSFSEIP reviewed each District FSEIP's Corrective Action for completion of activities and conducted a record audit of 10% or at a minimum 10 (which ever is greater) records from each District FSEIP to verify compliance of Transition Steps and Services.

Based on these reviews, District 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9 were found to be 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.

Based on these reviews, District 5 was found not to be 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 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.

**FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

*Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected*

The District 5 did not provide evidence of correction of Prong II of noncompliance for the Transition Conference and received a state-issued individualized Corrective Action Plans (CAP) to address systemic issues leading to noncompliance. In addition, targeted TA is being provided to the District FSEIP to address specific concerns identified.

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions**

**Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable**

This indicator is not applicable for the State.

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

**Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).**

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

This indicator is not applicable.

**FFY 2015 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											

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

**FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥				

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	<a href="#">2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	<a href="#">2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	<a href="#">2.1 Mediations held</a>	n	null

**FFY 2015 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0	0			

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

none

**FFY 2015 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
Target		63.00%	63.00%
Data	63.60%	62.40%	63.20%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	64.00%	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 2015 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 2015 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

**FFY 2015 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:** 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: Stacy Callender

Title: Part C Coordinator

Email: stacy.callender@msdh.ms.gov

Phone: 601-576-7427