

# MS Part C

# FFY2017 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 three public health regions, each of which operates multiple Local FSEIP responsible for ensure all eligible infants and toddlers and their families receive early intervention services. The Northern Region has two Local FSEIPs and the Central and Southern Regions have three Local FSEIPs each, for a total of eight Local FSEIPs. The MSFSEIP provides general supervision and technical assistance to each of the Local 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 Local FSEIPs to collect and report data in a timely manner.

During FFY2017, the MSDH underwent reorganization from nine public health Districts to three Regions. As a result of the reorganization, many Local FSEIP personnel changed their administrative leadership, direct supervisor (i.e., Regional Administrator or Local FSEIP Coordinator), and/or office location. These changes were mostly administrative in nature and did not result in any changes to the assignment of Service Coordinator service areas, assignment of children and families, or Service Providers. Throughout the process, the MSFSEIP supported the Local FSEIP by providing guidance and technical assistance. The MSFSEIP and Local FSEIPs engaged in ongoing implementation of systematic improvement efforts, although timelines were extended. The State experienced slippage in Indicators 3 [A2, B2, C2] (Child Outcomes) and 8C (Transition Conference). Local FSEIP 7 was monitored and had findings of noncompliance issued for Indicators 1 (Timely Services), 7 (45-Day), 8A (Transition Steps and Services), 8B (Transition Notification), and 8C (Transition Conference). The MSFSEIP was able to verify correction within one year for all findings except for Indicator 1 (Timely Services). Therefore, two Local FSEIPs have ongoing finding of noncompliance in Indicator 1 (Timely Services), i.e., Local FSEIP 5 and 7 that has not been verified as corrected. The MSFSEIP continues to enhance its general supervision model and differentiated technical assistance supports to improve compliance and outcomes for children and families.

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
<a href="#">ffy2017 sicc signature for apr.pdf</a>	Miranda Richardson	2/1/2019 4:07 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 Local FSEIP implements all Federal regulations and State policies and procedures for Part C of IDEA. The MSFSEIP monitors Local FSEIPs using a combination of methods including annual self-assessments, annual fiscal audits, annual 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 Local FSEIP (see TA Section below). These supports are intended to assist Local 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 Local 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.

**FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

The MSFSEIP provides ongoing technical assistance by identifying Local FSEIP needs and providing general, focused, and targeted TA to Local FSEIP and service providers. The MSFSEIP identify Local FSEIP training needs by periodic data analyses, QTA reports, and specific requests for TA. General TA is provided by MSFSEIP staff through monthly conference calls and quarterly Local FSEIP 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 Local FSEIPs. QTAs work with Program and Service Coordinators to identify root cause(s) of noncompliance and to develop strategies and activities for any Local FSEIP-developed Corrective Action Plans (CAPs) and Improvement Plans (IPs). QTAs also support all Local FSEIP staff in implementing CAPs and IPs with fidelity and documenting evidence of change.

The MSFSEIP has an Operations Director who oversees the Monitoring Coordinator and field-based QTAs. The Operations Director works with national experts on implementing train-the-trainer models of TA service delivery. The Operations 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.

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 provides annual training to Local FSEIP staff and providers on Federal regulations and State policies and procedures. In addition, the MSFSEIP provides Regional and Local FSEIP trainings on referral procedures, data system and child record maintenance, family rights, evaluation and eligibility determination, IFSP development and revisions, timely services, transition, working with families of children who are deaf/hard of hearing, routines-based model implementation, ongoing child assessments, and financial management.

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 Local 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, meets quarterly for a public meeting and more frequently for workgroup activities. The SICC is comprised of parents, service providers, state agency representatives from Health, Education, Human Services, Child Protective Services, Medicaid, and Insurance, representatives from Head Start, the Institute of Higher Learning (IHL), University programs, and

**FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

advocacy groups, and other community leaders.

On November 14, 2014, the SICC assisted the MSFSEIP in setting the FFY2014-FFY2018 APR targets for Indicators 2, 3, and 4:

- Indicator 2: Natural Environment target to set to remain at 95% for FFY2014-FFY2018.
- Indicator 3: Child Outcomes:
  - Summary Statement 1 for Outcomes A - C targets were set to remain at 85% for FFY2014-FFY2018.
  - Summary Statement 2 for Outcomes A - C targets were set as follow:
    - A2 – 65% for FFY2014-FFY2018
    - B2 – 63% for FFY2014-FFY2015
    - B2 – 64% for FFY2016
    - B2 – 64.5% for FFY2017
    - B2 – 65% for FFY2018
    - C2 – 63% for FFY2014-FFY2015
    - C2 – 63.5% for FFY2016
    - C2 – 64% for FFY2017-FFY2018
- Indicator 4: Family Survey targets were set at 92% for FFY2014-FFY2018.

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

- Indicator 5: Child Find 0-1 target was set as follows:
  - For FFY2014, the target was set at 0.61%
  - For FFY2015, the target was set at 0.62%
  - For FFY2016, the target was set at 0.63%
  - For FFY2017, the target was set at 0.64%
  - For FFY2018, the target was set at 0.65%
- Indicator 6: Child Find 0-3 target was as follows:
  - For FFY2014, the target was set at 1.72%
  - For FFY2015, the target was set at 1.74%
  - For FFY2016, the target was set at 1.76%
  - For FFY2017, the target was set at 1.78%
  - For FFY2018, the target was set at 1.80%

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 2016 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 2016 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 2016 APR in 2018, 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 Local FSEIP was disaggregated and shared at subsequent SICC meetings providing comparison relative to the MSFSEIP targets. The MSFSEIP also publishes several years of APR data on the MSDH website ([http://msdh.ms.gov/msdhsite/ static/41\\_0.74.63.html](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.			

## FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### Actions required in FFY 2016 response

### OSEP Response

States were instructed to submit Phase III Year Three of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) by April 1, 2019. The State provided the required information.

### Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part C determination for both 2018 and 2019 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2019 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

**FFY 2017 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	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	90.23%	86.80%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
1474	1933	86.80%	100%	86.14%

<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>	191
--	-----

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, 2017 - June 30, 2018

**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, 2017-June, 30 2018.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016**

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	0	0	1

**FFY 2016 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

*Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected*

Local FSEIP 7 has not provided evidence of correction of Prong II of noncompliance for the Timely Provision of Services. The State has worked with Local FSEIP 7 to address provider shortages in the area and has provided additional TA support thought out the year. The State has begun implementation of monthly meetings with Local FSEIP 7 personnel to address Timely Provision of Services.

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

*Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected*

Local FSEIP 5 has not provided evidence of correction of Prong II of noncompliance for the Timely Provision of Services. The State has worked with Local FSEIP 5 to address provider shortage in the area and has provided additional TA support thought out the year. The State has begun implementation of monthly meetings with Local FSEIP 5 personnel to address Timely Provision of Services.

**OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that the remaining one uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 and one uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 and each EIS program or provider with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 and 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 2018 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 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 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	2016
Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
Data	91.30%	89.71%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/11/2018	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings</a>	1,834	
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/11/2018	<a href="#">Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs</a>	2,064	

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
1,834	2,064	89.71%	95.00%	88.86%

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**





**FFY 2017 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	2016
A1	Target ≥	85.00%	85.00%
	Data	79.05%	77.78%
A2	Target ≥	65.00%	65.00%
	Data	65.45%	61.53%
B1	Target ≥	85.00%	85.00%
	Data	81.05%	77.92%
B2	Target ≥	63.00%	64.00%
	Data	61.23%	57.18%
C1	Target ≥	85.00%	85.00%
	Data	83.67%	80.80%
C2	Target ≥	63.00%	63.50%
	Data	61.56%	56.99%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

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

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	1003.00
--	---------

**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	1.99%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	118	11.76%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	261	26.02%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	338	33.70%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	266	26.52%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 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 $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$ .	599.00	737.00	77.78%	85.00%	81.28%
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 $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$ .	604.00	1003.00	61.53%	65.00%	60.22%

**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	20	1.99%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	136	13.56%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	315	31.41%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	337	33.60%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	195	19.44%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 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 $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$ .	652.00	808.00	77.92%	85.00%	80.69%
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 $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$ .	532.00	1003.00	57.18%	64.50%	53.04%

**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

**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	17	1.69%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	142	14.16%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	288	28.71%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	389	38.78%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	167	16.65%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2017
--	-----------	-------------	----------	----------	----------

**FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

			Data	Target	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).	677.00	836.00	80.80%	85.00%	80.98%
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).	556.00	1003.00	56.99%	64.00%	55.43%

**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	1925
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.	560

*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 2016 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 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	2016
A	Target ≥	92.00%	92.00%
	Data	86.84%	89.33%
B	Target ≥	92.00%	92.00%
	Data	87.80%	90.97%
C	Target ≥	92.00%	92.00%
	Data	86.63%	90.27%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

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

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Number of families to whom surveys were distributed	1,900
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	31.74% 603
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	552
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	601
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	559
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	601
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	537
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	598

	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their	89.33%	92.00%	91.85%

**FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
rights			
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	90.97%	92.00%	93.01%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	90.27%	92.00%	89.80%

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. No

Describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

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 enabling 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.

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 Program 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 2017, a total of 603 responses were collected yielding a response rate of 31.9% of families in the MSFSEIP. Analyses were conducted to determine the representatives 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, *African American* population was not representative to the population of families in Mississippi. *Asian, American Indian/Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander* participants responded at rates approximately equal to their percentage of the population. *White* participants responded at rates lower than their percentage of the population; and are under is under representative to the *White* families in Mississippi. (see *Table 1*). When disaggregated by geographic location according to the Local Program the respondent groups were not statistically different from the population of families for Local FSEIP 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9. Local FSEIP 5 was under represented (see *Table 2*).

**Table 1: Response Disaggregated by Race**

Mississippi	Race						Total
	African American or Black	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	White	More than one race	
# families in target population	1118458	12560	28725	572	1702268	35376	2897959
# families responded to survey	292	2	5	1	269	14	569
Target representation (% of families)	39%	0%	1%	0%	59%	1%	
Actual representation (% of families)	51%	0%	1%	0%	47%	2%	
Difference	13%	0%	0%	0%	-11%	1%	<b>Race Overall</b>
Are your data representative?	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	<b>No</b>

Mississippi	Hispanic Origin		
	Hispanic	Not Hispanic	Total
# families in target population	88261	2897959	2986220
# families responded to survey	20	583	603
Target representation (% of families)	3%	97%	
Actual representation (% of families)	3%	97%	
Difference	0%	0%	<b>Hispanic Overall</b>

# FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Are your data representative? Yes Yes Yes

Table 2: Response by Geographic

Local Programs	# of Families that Returned Survey by Local Program	# of EI Families by Local Program	% Returned Survey by Local Program	Proportion Representative of Responses by Local Program	% of EI Population by Local Program	Mississippi Population by Local Program *
Local FSEIP 1	186	356	52.2%	30.8%	18.7%	14.6%
Local FSEIP 2	73	321	22.7%	12%	16.9%	15.6%
Local FSEIP4	69	141	48.9%	11.4%	7.4%	6.9%
Local FSEIP 5	64	299	21.4%	10.6%	15.7%	21.5%
Local FSEIP 6	53	120	44.1%	8.8%	6.3%	9.1%
Local FSEIP 7	31	141	22%	5%	7.4%	5.7%
Local FSEIP 8	39	179	21.8%	6.5%	9.42%	10.3%
Local FSEIP 9	88	343	25.7%	14.6%	18.1%	16.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>603</b>	<b>1,900</b>	<b>31.9%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

\* Data source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

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 enabling 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 2016 response

none

## OSEP Response

## Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2018 response data are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program , and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the population.

**FFY 2017 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	2016
Target ≥	0.62%	0.63%
Data	0.57%	0.65%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	0.64%	0.65%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/11/2018	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs</a>	314	null
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2017	6/12/2018	<a href="#">Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1</a>	36,857	null

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
314	36,857	0.65%	0.64%	0.85%

**Compare your results to the national data**

State	Number served birth to 1 year	Number served 1 year to 2 years	Number served 2 years to 3 years	Number served birth through 2 years	Percentage of population <sup>1</sup> , birth through 2 years (%)
Mississippi	314	657	1,093	2,064	1.85
US and Outlying Areas	49,307	120,876	218,511	388,694	3.26

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**



**FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 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	2016
Target ≥	1.74%	1.76%
Data	1.72%	1.73%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	1.78%	1.80%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/11/2018	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs</a>	2,064	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2017	6/12/2018	<a href="#">Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3</a>	111,855	

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
2,064	111,855	1.73%	1.78%	1.85%

**Compare your results to the national data**

State	Number served birth to 1 year	Number served 1 year to 2 years	Number served 2 years to 3 years	Number served birth through 2 years	Percentage of population <sup>1</sup> , birth through 2 years (%)
Mississippi	314	657	1,093	2,064	1.85
US and Outlying Areas	49,307	120,876	218,511	388,694	3.26

**FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 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	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	94.78%	95.80%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
1,676	2,068	95.80%	100%	96.18%
<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>				313

**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, 2017 - June 30, 2018

**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, 2017-June, 30 2018.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 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 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

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 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

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

## OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that the remaining one uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 was corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 and each EIS program or provider with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2016: (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 2018 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 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

## Required Actions

**FFY 2017 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	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	93.58%	97.32%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
1,081	1,130	97.32%	100%	96.73%

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>	12
--	----

**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, 2017 - June 30, 2018

**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, 2017-June, 30 2018.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 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 2016**

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

**OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 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 2018 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 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

**Required Actions**

The State did not report that it identified any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance. In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must provide an explanation of why it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

**FFY 2017 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	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	97.62%	99.81%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
1,126	1,130	99.81%	100%	99.65%

<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
---	------

**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 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

July 1, 2017 - June 30, 2018

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, 2017-June, 30 2018.

### Actions required in FFY 2016 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 2016

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

### OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 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 2018 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 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

### Required Actions

The State did not report that it identified any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance. In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must provide an explanation of why it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

**FFY 2017 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	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	91.29%	97.32%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
978	1,130	97.32%	100%	91.24%

<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>	53

**Reasons for Slippage**

**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 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

July 1, 2017 - June 30, 2018

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, 2017-June, 30 2018.

## Actions required in FFY 2016 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 2016

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 2016 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 review. The MSFSEIP conducted a record audit of 10% or at a minimum 10 (whichever is greater) records from Local FSEIP to verify compliance of Transition Conference.

Based on the record reviews, Local Program 7 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 MSFSIEP verified that Local FSEIP 7 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

Although the State's FFY 2017 data represent slippage from the FFY 2016 data and the State did not meet its FFY 2017 target for this indicator, the State did not, as required, provide an explanation of slippage.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 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 2018 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 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

## Required Actions

The State did not, as required by the OSEP Response to the State's FFY 2016 SPP/APR, provide an explanation of slippage. In its FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must provide the required information.

**FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions**

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

MS Part C does not follow MS Part B Due Process Procedures.

*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, as described above.

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

**OSEP Response**

This indicator is not applicable to the State.

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 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	2016
Target ≥		
Data		

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥		

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	<a href="#">2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	<a href="#">2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	<a href="#">2.1 Mediations held</a>	n	null

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
0	0	0			

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2017. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

--

**FFY 2017 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	2017
Target		63.00%	63.00%	64.00%	64.50%
Data	63.60%	62.40%	63.20%	60.60%	52.70%

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

**FFY 2018 Target**

FFY	2018
Target	65.00%

Key:

**Description of Measure**

See attachment

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**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 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

# FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

- (a) 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.
- (b) 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.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) 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

- (a) 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.
- (b) 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.
- (c) 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

- (a) 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.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) 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).
- (d) 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.

see document



# FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## 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 2017 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: Early Intervention Director/Part C Coordinator

Email: Stacy.Callender@msdh.ms.gov

Phone: 601-576-7427