



# EARLY SUPPORT FOR INFANTS AND TODDLERS: 2017 – 2018 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT



WASHINGTON STATE  
**Department of  
Children, Youth, and Families**

**Executive Summary:**

The Department Children, Youth, and Families (DCYF) is a new cabinet level agency focused on the well-being of children. Our vision is to ensure that "Washington state's children and youth grow up safe and healthy—thriving physically, emotionally and academically, nurtured by family and community." (House Bill 1661)

DCYF serves as the State Lead Agency for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C program for Washington State. Within DCYF, the Part C programmatic home is the Early Support for Infants and Toddlers (ESIT) program.

During Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2017, the ESIT program held contracts with twenty-four (24) Local Lead Agencies (LLAs) statewide in order to ensure that all families have equitable access to a locally coordinated system of early intervention services. As a result, 17,658 eligible infants, toddlers and their families received early intervention services during the past year. The types of organizations that administered each local early intervention system included:

- 1 county regional health district
- 4 county human service agencies
- 1 combined health and human services agency
- 14 nonprofit agencies; and
- 4 educational service districts

To ensure services are coordinated and conform to IDEA Part C requirements, each LLA develops and maintains subcontracts or local interagency agreements and local plans with individual early intervention providers or providing organizations within their geographic service area.

This past year, the ESIT program met the following targets:

- Services in natural environments (Indicator 2)
- Child Find (Indicators 5 and 6)
- Early childhood transition with the development of timely IFSPs 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 (Indicator 8A)
- Early childhood transition with timely notifications to 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 (Indicator 8B)

ESIT had no mediations that resulted in mediation agreements.

ESIT showed improvement for results of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family (Indicator 4):

- A. Know their rights increased by 3.45%
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs increased by 3.74%
- C. Help their children develop and learn increased by 5.03%

Although ESIT did not meet target for Child Outcomes (Indicator 3), there was an increased percentage of performance for a majority of the outcomes including Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills for Summary Statement 1, which was a 1.05% increase from last year. This increase was the results of the State Systemic Improvement Plan efforts and activities.

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**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.

General Supervision System:

The Early Support for Infants and Toddlers (ESIT) program continues to direct its general supervision and monitoring efforts through the following:

- Aligning and integrating activities with the Annual Performance Report (APR);

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

- Meeting federal requirements for states to monitor implementation of IDEA, both APR indicators and related requirements;
- Focusing on compliance and quality practices, especially those closely aligned with results for children and families; and
- Directing state technical assistance resources to those local lead agencies in greatest need.

### Monitoring Local Lead Agencies (LLAs) on APR Indicators

ESIT Data Management System (DMS): All APR indicator data, with the exception of Indicator 4 - Family Outcomes, is retrieved from the DMS. The DMS creates an electronic Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) record that documents essential child and family information from initial contacts through transition. All child and family information must be entered into the DMS. This includes initial evaluation/assessment results, medical information, eligibility determination, and the child outcome summary (which incorporates a description of functional performance), family statement, individual child and family outcomes and services information. All this information is required to be entered into the DMS before an IFSP can be issued as completed.

Child level data is retrieved from IFSPs entered into the DMS and used for APR reporting. DMS business rules and calendar tools ensure either required information is entered into the system or a reason for not entering the information is supplied. When required information is not entered into the DMS in a timely manner, the system creates red alerts on the family resources coordinator's (FRC) calendar. The calendar is monitored by local lead agency (LLA) staff (i.e. FRCs, program managers, agency administrators) and ESIT staff. Red alerts are reviewed and technical assistance is provided by the ESIT staff.

*Results Indicators:* APR Indicators 2, 5, and 6 results data is obtained from all IFSPs entered into the DMS on December 1 of the contract year as reported in 618 data submissions gathered throughout the Federal Fiscal Year. Indicator 4 data is collected from hard copy, electronic and phone surveys completed by families and submitted to ESIT annually.

*Compliance Indicators:* APR Indicators 1, 7, 8, 8A, 8B, and 8C compliance data is retrieved from all IFSPs over a three (3) month period. DMS data is reviewed and verified for accuracy.

*Identification and Correction of Non-Compliance:* ESIT staff review and analyze compliance data to assess the "reasons" for any noncompliance (delayed services). When necessary, ESIT staff request and obtain clarification regarding reasons for late services, IFSP meeting, transition plan, and transition notification or transition conference to determine the root cause of noncompliance. If late services were due to exceptional family circumstances, findings of noncompliance are not made. If late services were due to reasons other than exceptional family circumstances, child specific noncompliance is identified and findings are issued. If it was determined that the noncompliance was already corrected, a finding is still issued, but a corrective action plan is not required. Even though correction occurred (the service provided though late), ESIT staff still assesses the level of noncompliance, identifies the contributing factors, if any, and determines if the noncompliance was isolated or systemic.

Within three (3) months from when compliance-monitoring data is retrieved from the DMS, each LLA receives a written notice of findings of noncompliance and the need to make timely correction. Upon receipt of written notice, each LLA administrator is directed to begin implementing required improvement activities to ensure correction is made, as soon as possible, but no later than one year from notification. Once correction of findings of noncompliance is achieved, the LLA receives a written notice that correction of noncompliance was attained.

When required, corrective action plans (CAPs) outline the resources needed to be accessed and timelines to follow in order to achieve compliance and/or improve performance. CAPs are required of all LLAs that do not fully correct identified noncompliance by the time annual determinations are issued.

In FFY16, ESIT was in the process of changing the approach to issuing findings of noncompliance. ESIT will no longer issue findings of noncompliance if the findings were previously corrected prior to ESIT sending notifications of findings of noncompliance.

### Annual Determination Process

ESIT makes an annual determination of LLA efforts in implementing the requirements and purposes of IDEA, Part C. Each LLA APR data is aggregated by ESIT for annual reporting purposes. This aggregated data is used by the federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) to make ESIT's annual determination.

ESIT staff disaggregates and evaluates this data to make LLA annual determinations. LLA determination status is based on the following:

1. Compliance Data
  - Indicator 1 - timely services
  - Indicator 7 - timely evaluations and meeting the 45-day timeline
  - Indicator 8A - transition plan steps and services
  - Indicator 8C - transition conference
2. Timely correction of noncompliance
3. All Indicators must be timely, valid and reliable
4. Citizen's complaints filed and/or due process hearing or mediations held

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

uses the four (4) OSEP determination categories to make LLA determinations. The enforcement actions and sanctions applied to ESIT are applied to LLAs. Before LLAs status determinations are made, ESIT notifies the LLA of any findings of noncompliance. Within 120 days from when ESIT submitted the APR to OSEP, determination status results for each LLA are posted on the ESIT website.

Dispute Resolution Options

The timely administrative resolution of complaints occurs through established mediation, complaint, and due process hearing procedures. Monitoring the use of these dispute resolution options assists ESIT in identifying noncompliance and other systemic issues. By following each procedure's required steps and timelines, the resolution of any dispute will occur in a timely manner. Families are made aware of their dispute resolution options throughout their participation in the early intervention program. ESIT has a system in place to track and monitor complaint, mediation and due process dispute resolution activities. Parent identified issues are typically resolved through informal procedures rather than the formal dispute resolution options that are available to them.

Biennial Local Team Self-Assessment Process

Each LLA self-assessment team (comprised of early intervention providers, family resources coordinators and administrators who supervise providers) is required to complete the self-assessment biennially through a review of children's records. In addition, each LLA is now required to complete a portion of the Local Child Outcomes Measurement System Self-Assessment (LCOMS-SA). Each LLA submits a Local System Improvement Plan with a minimum of one improvement activity related to the local team self-assessment results and one activity related to the LCOMS-SA. The LLA implements improvement strategies throughout the following contract year. The self-assessment tool and process is designed to gather data from each LLA on state selected data that is not available through the DMS. These data are used to substantiate compliance with IDEA and related requirements associated with each APR indicator, and to encourage the use of best practices associated with improved results for children and families.

On-site Targeted Technical Assistance

Targeted technical assistance is provided to individual LLAs, a selected group of LLAs, or statewide as needs are identified. Through the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), LLAs that are implementation sites receive targeted training and technical assistance as described in Indicator 11. Monitoring, complaints, mediation, and due process data may be used to identify and provide technical assistance. On-site targeted technical assistance is provided more frequently when ESIT or an LLA has identified an issue or set of issues that require focused attention. The technical assistance visit may center on the exploration of factors that might contribute to the present performance or system concern/issue. Information, resources, and supports are provided based on the contributing factors or identified concerns and issues.

**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 Early Support for Infant and Toddlers (ESIT) program employs program consultants with Part C experience to provide technical assistance to local lead agency (LLA) contractors statewide. Technical assistance is provided through methods including, as needed; email and phone calls, quarterly calls, and on-site visits, depending on locally identified needs or concerns. Regional LLA meetings occur quarterly in various eastern and western Washington locations.

Meeting topics include; discussion and sharing regarding challenges, successes and evidence-based early intervention practices. ESIT provides direction through practice guides and other written materials. Technical assistance is provided on a variety of topics through webinar recordings. State and national resources are accessed through electronic sources and websites. ESIT technical assistance materials and other publications may be accessed by going to <https://www.dcyf.wa.gov/services/child-dev-support-providers/esit/training>.

**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.

Through contracts with the Early Support for Infants and Toddlers (ESIT) program, local lead agencies (LLAs) are required to ensure all early intervention programs employ qualified personnel. This contract requirement pertains to employing service coordinators or family resources coordinators (FRCs). ESIT guidance on minimum education and state licensure/certification/registration requirements are

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

posted on the ESIT website. This guidance information is accessible by going to [https://www.dcyf.wa.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/esit/Qualified\\_Personnel\\_Guidelines.pdf](https://www.dcyf.wa.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/esit/Qualified_Personnel_Guidelines.pdf).

The Office of Superintendent for Public Instruction and Department of Health license or certify most providers. ESIT provides a statewide training and registration system for FRCs. Maintaining current FRC registration status requires meeting annual training requirements.

ESIT offers three basic Part C online training modules, quarterly professional learning community (PLC) seminars, and various training opportunities on current topics throughout the year. Training occurs through webinars, conference calls or local onsite workshops. Two curricula, developed by and for parents explaining Part C and transition are posted on the website. Training efforts are in place statewide and in local implementation sites as part of ESIT’s State Systemic Improvement Plan.

ESIT is a major sponsor and active participant on the planning committee for the statewide Infant and Early Childhood Conference that occurs each year. This important conference draws professionals and interested stakeholders from across the state’s many early childhood programs. State and national experts from diverse early childhood backgrounds continue to be key conference and workshop presenters. This conference continues to serve as the state’s key early childhood professional development event.

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.

SICC Special Meeting -- Annual Performance Report (APR) Review

January 16, 2019, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) met to review the Washington State’s Part C State Annual Performance Report. The SICC provided input and requested additional clarification. Some Indicators were discussed in more detail with SICC input integrated into indicator sections as appropriate. SICC did not recommend changes to any targets that were previously set.

Target Setting Meetings –Local Stakeholder Involvement

Stakeholder meetings were convened in November 2014 to discuss APR target setting. A broad range of stakeholders participated including; early intervention service providers, agency administrators, local lead agency (LLA) staff and school district staff. The group was given the task of reviewing data and making recommendations to ESIT on targets covering the next six years for Indicators 2, 3a,b,c, 4a,b,c, 5 and 6.

An overview of the indicators and parameters of target setting were presented. Participants were divided into small groups and given a data packet for reference in their discussions. The data packet showed state trends for each results indicator over the past several years. After discussion and analysis, individuals from the groups generated a recommendation for each target for the next six years. ESIT staff were present to answer any questions.

Results were compiled and the mean, median, and modes were calculated for each indicator for each year. The groups’ input was consolidated into one set of indicators for each year and presented at a special APR review meeting of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) in January 2015.

January 16, 2019, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) met to reviewed all target setting for Indicators 2, 3a,b,c, 4a,b,c, 5 and 6 as a part of the annual performance review process. The Council did not recommend changes to any targets that were previously set.

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 Early Support for Infants and Toddlers Program made the following items available to the public on the program website (<https://www.dcyf.wa.gov/practice/oiaa/reports>):

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

- Annual Performance Report (APR)
- Local Lead Agency APR Data
- Local Lead Agency Determination Status Reports
- 618 data tables

Information on how these reports could be accessed was emailed to our SICC, LLAs, and other stakeholders.

On June 26, 2018, the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) FFY 2016 Determination Letter notified the director of the Washington State Department of Early Learning (DEL), the State Lead Agency for Part C, that the Washington State Part C program met requirements of Part C of the IDEA.

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

### Actions required in FFY 2016 response

--

**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		87.00%	90.00%	95.00%	97.00%	98.30%	99.10%	99.00%	99.20%	99.08%	98.16%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	96.57%	97.93%

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
3966	4229	97.93%	100%	96.90%

**Reasons for Slippage**

While maintaining a relatively high level of compliance, slippage occurred, resulting in a decrease of 1.33% between FFY2016 (97.93%) and FFY 2017 (96.90%).

Upon further data analysis, it was determined that slippage occurred mostly in five (5) counties. Three (3) of these counties had a significant increase in enrollment greater than 10 percent from the previous year.

Local lead agencies located in these counties reported an increased shortage of providers available to provider early intervention services. Some agencies have been contracting with local independent therapist to meet the demand for increased services.

We believe the slippage may have occurred due to an increased number of eligible children being identified, which challenged provider capacity to meet this requirement.

ESIT staff is in the process of creating training and technical assistance guidance on effective scheduling to meet timelines and appropriate documentation for late reasons (late other and exceptional family circumstances).

Other state efforts include:

- ESIT staff working with the Recruitment and Retention Workgroup, a subcommittee of the Personnel and Training Committee from the State Interagency Coordinating Counsel to address the provider shortage in Washington.
- ESIT staff is exploring options for an Early Intervention Certification, offered through higher education, to support the growth of early intervention professionals in Washington State.

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

This number will be added to the "Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

132

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).

Washington State's criteria for timely receipt of early intervention services requires the provider agency to conduct an initial evaluation and

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

assessments and the initial IFSP within 45 days from the date the provider agency received the referral. The early interventions services listed on the initial IFSP must start within 30 days from the initial IFSP date or have a planned start date set in the future (beyond 30 days from the IFSP date). When a future planned start date is set, the actual service must start on or before that date.

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).

Data were collected from July 1, 2017 through September 30, 2017 and was obtained from all IFSPs entered into the ESIT Data Management System (DMS) during this period.

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

The three months of data collected from all IFSPs during this period contained the full range of variability exhibited by the population served by ESIT throughout the year. The data is from all programs across the state making it representative of the entire state.

#### 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
68	68	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

The ESIT program verified that it corrected all findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02.

ESIT staff, Local Lead Agency (LLA) administrators, Family Resources Coordinators (FRCs), and providers used the ESIT Data Management System (DMS) IFSP Compliance Report to review data.

From the date the LLA received a finding letter for noncompliance, the LLA had one year to correct identified non-compliance for each indicator not meeting 100%. Each LLA reviewed compliance reports from the DMS to ensure data was entered accurately into the system and that the regulatory requirements regarding timely service provision were being met.

To verify that noncompliance was correctly addressing the regulatory requirements, each LLA reviewed and identified a minimum of two weeks of DMS data. If data demonstrated compliance for each indicator where findings were issued, compliance was considered achieved. The LLA then submitted the DMS data to ESIT staff for reverification. After ESIT staff verified the data submitted, (and verified correction of individual child noncompliance, ESIT staff sent a letter documenting that noncompliance was fully corrected.

If correction of non-compliance has not been verified within one-year of the findings, ESIT staff notifies the LLA that they must develop a CAP. During FFY16, no LLA met the criteria for needing a CAP.

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

ESIT staff verified correction of each individual incidence of non-compliance through the ESIT data management system (DMS). The DMS provides a start date and an actual start date for every new service initiated in an IFSP. If a service is late, the DMS requires the user to enter a reason for the delay.

Late Exceptional Family Circumstance (EFC): extraordinary events that prevent the family from participating in required events on time.

Late Other: events identified by the early intervention program or provider and not the family that prevent required events from being completed on time.

ESIT staff reviewed compliance reports from the DMS during the annual compliance monitoring period and subsequent intervals as

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

needed to verify each individual instance of noncompliance is corrected unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the local lead agency, the family declined services, or the local lead agency was unable to make contact with the family.

**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 ≥			65.00%	70.00%	80.00%	85.00%	90.00%	91.00%	92.00%	92.25%	92.50%
Data		48.00%	62.00%	74.00%	83.00%	89.00%	90.80%	91.30%	92.50%	94.06%	94.49%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	92.75%	93.00%
Data	95.34%	95.54%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	93.25%	93.50%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

**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>	7,888	
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/11/2018	<a href="#">Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs</a>	8,199	

**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
7,888	8,199	95.54%	93.25%	96.21%

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**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 ≥						69.90%	70.00%	70.10%	70.20%	56.21%	56.25%
		Data					69.80%	70.00%	65.80%	64.60%	57.50%	56.21%	56.38%
A2	2013	Target ≥						61.40%	64.20%	61.60%	61.70%	54.77%	55.00%
		Data					61.30%	62.50%	57.70%	56.60%	57.70%	54.77%	56.14%
B1	2013	Target ≥						64.10%	64.20%	64.30%	64.50%	65.11%	65.11%
		Data					64.00%	63.10%	59.80%	57.00%	61.80%	65.11%	63.71%
B2	2013	Target ≥						60.80%	60.90%	61.00%	61.10%	56.79%	57.00%
		Data					60.70%	61.00%	57.30%	57.20%	55.00%	56.79%	52.54%
C1	2013	Target ≥						71.20%	71.30%	71.40%	71.50%	68.26%	68.50%
		Data					71.10%	74.70%	68.60%	69.90%	65.40%	68.26%	66.86%
C2	2013	Target ≥						67.70%	67.80%	67.90%	68.00%	58.17%	58.25%
		Data					67.60%	65.00%	61.00%	60.10%	57.30%	58.17%	56.73%

	FFY	2015	2016
A1	Target ≥	56.50%	56.70%
	Data	56.63%	55.69%
A2	Target ≥	55.25%	55.50%
	Data	56.25%	53.71%
B1	Target ≥	65.11%	65.50%
	Data	64.12%	64.96%
B2	Target ≥	57.20%	57.40%
	Data	51.95%	50.43%
C1	Target ≥	68.75%	69.00%
	Data	66.04%	66.04%
C2	Target ≥	58.50%	58.75%
	Data	54.67%	53.71%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	56.80%	58.25%
Target A2 ≥	55.75%	56.00%
Target B1 ≥	65.75%	66.00%
Target B2 ≥	57.60%	57.80%
Target C1 ≥	69.25%	69.50%
Target C2 ≥	59.00%	59.35%

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	5781.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	68.00	1.18%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1682.00	29.10%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	936.00	16.19%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1359.00	23.51%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1736.00	30.03%

	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 $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$ .	2295.00	4045.00	55.69%	56.80%	56.74%
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 $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$ .	3095.00	5781.00	53.71%	55.75%	53.54%

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	57.00	0.99%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1527.00	26.41%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1193.00	20.64%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1777.00	30.74%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1227.00	21.22%

	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 $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$ .	2970.00	4554.00	64.96%	65.75%	65.22%
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 $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$ .	3004.00	5781.00	50.43%	57.60%	51.96%

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	59.00	1.02%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1492.00	25.81%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1048.00	18.13%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2002.00	34.63%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1180.00	20.41%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 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 $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$ .	3050.00	4601.00	66.04%	69.25%	66.29%
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 $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$ .	3182.00	5781.00	53.71%	59.00%	55.04%

**FFY 2017 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)****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	7909
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.	2128

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.**

Outcome Measurement Policies and Procedures

Washington State's outcome measurement policies and procedures require all eligible infants and toddlers who have received at least six months of early intervention services to have child outcome data collected at entry and exit.

Child outcome entry data is gathered prior to completing each initial IFSP, with an exception when a child entered early intervention at 30 months of age or later. Under this circumstance, the child is not required to have an entry COS rating because s/he would not have been in service for the required six-month period. All infants and toddlers, who had an entry COS and received at least six months of consecutive services, had an exit COS completed prior to leaving early intervention.

Washington State's IFSP process integrates the child outcome summary into the initial evaluation and assessment process. Training and technical assistance continue to focus on gathering functional information about the child to inform the child outcome summary rating process. Because of the integrated child outcome summary and IFSP process, evaluation and assessment data are used in a more consistent way to determine child outcome summary ratings.

Measurement Strategies and Data Collection

The child's IFSP team, which includes the child's parent, used a variety of data sources to determine the child's level of functioning in each child outcome area. IFSP teams made assessment tool selections based on the needs of the child and family. The child's functional performance was rated following the ECO child outcome summary process. The data sources used by the team included standardized tools, curriculum-based measures, parent/caregiver report, professional observations, and other relevant assessment information. When standardized tools or curriculum-based instruments were administered, the instruments or measures most frequently used included:

- Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System for Infants and Children (AEPS) -- Birth to three
- Battelle Developmental Inventory
- Developmental Assessment of Young Children (DAYC)
- Bayley Scales of Infant and Toddler Development

Local lead agency staff enter child outcome summary data into the data management system on an ongoing basis.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**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	2013	Target ≥					77.00%	79.00%	81.00%	83.00%	85.00%	82.36%	82.50%
		Data			67.00%	78.00%	81.00%	97.00%	96.80%	96.80%	96.94%	82.36%	81.55%
B	2013	Target ≥					82.00%	84.00%	86.00%	88.00%	90.00%	90.44%	90.50%
		Data			78.00%	86.00%	88.00%	98.00%	97.40%	97.70%	97.90%	90.44%	88.54%
C	2013	Target ≥					87.00%	89.00%	91.00%	93.00%	95.00%	86.46%	86.50%
		Data			83.00%	93.00%	92.00%	97.00%	96.30%	97.40%	97.89%	86.46%	85.98%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	82.75%	83.00%
	Data	81.78%	75.72%
B	Target ≥	90.75%	91.00%
	Data	88.39%	81.86%
C	Target ≥	86.75%	87.00%
	Data	87.65%	80.07%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	83.25%	83.50%
Target B ≥	91.25%	91.50%
Target C ≥	87.25%	87.50%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Number of families to whom surveys were distributed	4036.00
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	22.84% 922.00
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	703.00
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	888.00
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	761.00
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	889.00
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	754.00
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	886.00

	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
--	---------------	-----------------	---------------

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

	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 rights	75.72%	83.25%	79.17%
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	81.86%	91.25%	85.60%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	80.07%	87.25%	85.10%

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.

Improvement Strategies:

Last fiscal year, we developed a family survey child list report in the state's data management system (DMS) that included child/family contact information, along with child's age, family language and race/ethnicity to improve statewide representativeness. This report was used to determine how many surveys needed to be produced for mailing, prioritize how many surveys needed to be translated into primary languages spoken by families and to determine how many temporary staff needed to assist with calling families.

ESIT mailed an introductory letter and a printed survey to families exited the program in the past six (6) months, families whose child had at least six (6) months of services, and/or who had an annual IFSP. The letter states the purpose of the survey and how the data is used.

ESIT translated the surveys into the primary languages spoken by the families. Translated languages include Spanish, Vietnamese, Arabic, Hindi, Japanese, Chinese, Russian, and Somali. Families had the option of calling a number to request assistance from temporary ESIT staff. In addition, ESIT staff called families to let them know they would receive a family survey in the mail and provided an option to complete the survey over the phone. This allowed ESIT the ability to distribute surveys to targeted underrepresented groups with follow-up communication as needed. Temporary staff completed follow-up phone calls in both English and Spanish.

ESIT implemented the following improvement strategies:

- Revised the cover letter to be more family friendly and included the families' early intervention provider's name.
- Hired temporary staff to call families to let them know to expect the survey, or to complete the survey over the phone.
- Included a magnet in the mailing to increase the response rate.
- Implement targeted outreach, such as follow-up calls to non-responsive families, especially those in under-represented groups.
- Use an interpreter line to contact families whose primary language is other than English and Spanish.
- Posted the surveys on our agency's website in English and Spanish to allow families additional access to the survey.

In addition, ESIT received support and strategies ideas from the Family Outcomes Data Community of Practice to address the challenges of underrepresentation.

Although data analysis showed overall under-representation, the implemented strategies did improve the percentage of surveys returned that were provided to families written their primary language. Spanish survey return rates increased by 5% between FFY16 and FFY17. Other languages with increased return rates included Chinese, Vietnamese, Arabic, and Somali.

The implemented strategies helped ESIT staff prioritize targeted technical assistance. ESIT staff reviewed local family outcome data with local lead agencies and then assisted with developing improvement activities that will be reflected on the local system improvement plan.

In addition, ESIT staff reevaluated the implemented strategies and developed additional future strategies:

Future Improvement Strategies:

- ESIT is hiring a project staff person to manage data processes and collection of the family outcome surveys.
- Send out family surveys more frequently to identified underserve geographic and population areas
- Explore contracting with a state university to administer the survey to improve over all data collection.
- Providing targeting technical assistance to areas of the state where low response rate and under representatives occurred.
- Continue conducting follow-up phone calls to families and using the interpreter line to reach families that speak languages other than English and Spanish.
- Send local lead agencies, FRCs and providers talking points to let families know they may be receiving a survey in the mail and encourage them to complete the paper or electronic survey.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants,

FFY 2017 family outcome data continued to be collected and reported using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Revised Family Survey. Some respondent families did not respond to all ECO Family Survey questions.

ESIT staff mailed a cover letter and the printed surveys to families whose child exited the program in the last 6 months, who received services for at least 6 months and/or who had an Annual IFSP. The letter stated the purpose of the survey and how the data is used. Surveys were available in multiple languages. Families had the option of calling a number to request assistance from ESIT staff to complete the survey over the phone. In addition, ESIT temporary staff called families, letting them know that they would receive a family survey in the mail and provided an option to complete the survey over the phone. This allowed ESIT the ability to distribute surveys targeting underrepresented groups with follow-up communication as needed.

The representativeness (geographic area, region, race/ethnicity, age of the child, length of program participation, and socio-economic status) of survey respondents was assessed by comparing survey response data with the December 1 Child Count Data. Demographic data was obtained from all geographic areas of the state.

When considering age of child, children birth–12 months and 13–24 months were underrepresented, with 25–36 months being overrepresented when compared to 2017 December 1 Child Count data.

Age of Child	Survey Responses	December 1, 2017 Child Count
Birth – 12 months	3%	18%
13 – 24 months	18%	35%
25 – 36 months	79%	47%
No response	less than .064%	

When considering ethnicity/race of the child, those children identified with two or more races and White were overrepresented compared to the December 1 Child Count Data. Black or African American and Hispanic children were underrepresented.

Race/Ethnicity	Survey Responses	December 1, 2017
White	59%	56%
Hispanic	12%	23%
Asian	6%	6%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1%	1%
Black or African American	2%	4%
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2%	2%
Two or more races	17%	8%

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2017 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.

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2016 OSEP response**

For FFY17, the representativeness (geographic area, region, race/ethnicity, age of the child, length of program participation, and socio-  
 2/1/2019 Page 16 of 38

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

economic status) of survey respondents was assessed by comparing survey response data with the December 1 Child Count Data. Demographic data was obtained from all geographic areas of the state.

When considering age of child, children birth–12 months and 13–24 months were underrepresented, with 25–36 months being overrepresented when compared to 2017 December 1 Child Count data.

Age of Child	Survey Responses	December 1, 2017 Child Count
Birth – 12 months	3%	18%
13 – 24 months	18%	35%
25 – 36 months	79%	47%
No response	less than .064%	

When considering ethnicity/race of the child, those children identified with two or more races and White were overrepresented compared to the December 1 Child Count Data. Black or African American and Hispanic children were underrepresented.

Race/Ethnicity	Survey Responses	December 1, 2017
White	59%	56%
Hispanic	12%	23%
Asian	6%	6%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1%	1%
Black or African American	2%	4%
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2%	2%
Two or more races	17%	8%

Based on this data analysis, ESIT plans to add additional strategies to improve overall data collection including increasing response rate and increasing data that are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program:

- Hiring a project staff person to manage data processes and collection of the family outcome surveys.
- Sending out family surveys more frequently to identified underserve geographic and population areas
- Exploring contracting with a state university to administer the survey to improve over all data collection.
- Providing targeting technical assistance to areas of the state where low response rate and under representatives occurred.

**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 ≥			0.70%	0.80%	0.90%	0.97%	1.00%	1.10%	1.20%	0.78%	0.82%
Data		0.51%	0.53%	0.53%	0.46%	0.51%	0.58%	0.63%	0.75%	1.13%	1.27%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	0.85%	0.89%
Data	1.47%	1.44%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	0.92%	0.96%

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>	1,471	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>	90,480	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
1,471	90,480	1.44%	0.92%	1.63%

**Compare your results to the national data**

(Sources: Grads360; the number and percent of infants and toddlers receiving early intervention services under IDEA, Part C, by age and state; Institution: U.S. Department of Education; Publication Year: 2017 <https://osep.grads360.org/#communities/pdc/documents/9795>)

When comparing Washington State data with national data for Indicator 5, Washington was above the national average.

Washington's data for this indicator was 1.63%, and the national average for this indicator was 1.25%.

This reflects state and local efforts to better identify eligible infants under the age of 12 months. ESIT collected data for this indicator in the statewide data management system. Local lead agencies have access to a report in state's data management system (DMS) that provides the percent of children from birth to one year old with IFSPs compared the state total population of children from birth to one year old at a point-in-time.

We anticipate an increase number of children served with Washington States continued efforts to support universal developmental screenings for all children. Statewide Parent/Caregiver Outreach and Public Awareness Parent/caregiver awareness about the

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

importance of developmental screening increased over the past year through Washington's WithinReach and Parent Help 123/Help Me Grow websites: <http://www.withinreachwa.org/> and <http://www.parenthelp123.org/child-development/help-me-grow-washington>.

WithinReach Family Health Hotline continued to serve as ESIT's central directory contractor and provided statewide information and referral to ESIT Family Resources Coordinators (FRCs). WithinReach Family Health Hotline continued to be the 1-800 number families call if they have concerns or questions about their child's development or need to find out how to access public health insurance, immunizations for their child, food or housing assistance, etc.

CHILD Profile continued to serve as an effective ESIT public awareness resource to families. CHILD Profile is a program of the Department of Health (DOH) that provided immunization tracking and continued to distribute free child development and health information for Washington families that have children ages birth to six years of age. CHILD Profile continued to serve as Washington State's Health Promotion and Immunization Registry system. ESIT continued to contract with CHILD Profile to distribute three specific targeted mailings to families statewide with information on how children grow and develop. This information also included the WithinReach Family Health Hotline phone number, should families have a concern about their child's development. Parents of all children born in Washington State get these free materials. Children and families who move into the state could also be added to the system by their health care provider. Parents were also able to sign up directly to receive the materials. For more information about CHILD Profile, go to <https://www.doh.wa.gov/YouandYourFamily/Immunization/ChildProfileHealthPromotion/ForParents>

Some local lead agencies reported local initiatives to increase child find in their counties. This included

- Collaborating with neonatal programs on building relationships and understanding to improve referral channels into early intervention.
- Developing memorandums of understanding with Early Head Start and other home visiting programs as a part of the State Systemic Improvement Plan efforts.
- King County, the state's largest county is working on a Developmental Screening initiative that resulted in 500 people trained on completing the ASQ. Those trained include a variety of early learning professionals and family members.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**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 ≥			1.80%	1.90%	2.00%	2.20%	2.30%	2.40%	2.50%	2.26%	2.32%
Data		1.79%	1.79%	1.82%	1.90%	1.83%	2.12%	2.10%	2.20%	2.28%	2.44%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	2.38%	2.43%
Data	2.69%	2.77%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	2.49%	2.55%

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>	8,199	
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>	274,550	

**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
8,199	274,550	2.77%	2.49%	2.99%

**Compare your results to the national data**

(Sources: Grads360; the number and percent of infants and toddlers receiving early intervention services under IDEA, Part C, by age and state; Institution: U.S. Department of Education; Publication Year: 2017 <https://osep.grad360.org/#communities/pdc/documents/9795>)

When comparing Washington State data with national data for Indicator 6, Washington was below the national average. Washington's data for this indicator was 2.99%, and the national average for this indicator was 3.26%. However, Washington continues to increase the percentage of children served each year and exceeding the state's target. This reflects the effort that has been made at both the state and local level to reach out and identify more infants and toddlers that are eligible for early intervention services.

Local lead agencies have access to a report in state's data management system (DMS) that provides the percent of children from birth to three year old with IFSPs compared the state total population of children from birth to one year old at a point-in-time.

We anticipate a continuous increase number of children served with the Washington States continued efforts to support universal developmental screenings for all children. Statewide Parent/Caregiver Outreach and Public Awareness Parent/caregiver awareness about the importance of developmental screening increased over the past year through Washington's WithinReach and Parent Help

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

123/Help Me Grow websites: <http://www.withinreachwa.org/> and <http://www.parenthelp123.org/child-development/help-me-grow-washington>. WithinReach Family Health Hotline continued to serve as ESIT's central directory contractor and provided statewide information and referral to ESIT Family Resources Coordinators (FRCs). WithinReach Family Health Hotline continued to be the 1-800 number families call if they have concerns or questions about their child's development or need to find out how to access public health insurance, immunizations for their child, food or housing assistance, etc.

CHILD Profile continued to serve as an effective ESIT public awareness resource to families. CHILD Profile is a program of the Department of Health (DOH) that provided immunization tracking and continued to distribute free child development and health information for Washington families that have children ages birth to six years of age. CHILD Profile continued to serve as Washington State's Health Promotion and Immunization Registry system. ESIT continued to contract with CHILD Profile to distribute three specific targeted mailings to families statewide with information on how children grow and develop. This information also included the WithinReach Family Health Hotline phone number, should families have a concern about their child's development. Parents of all children born in Washington State get these free materials. Children and families who move into the state could also be added to the system by their health care provider. Parents were also able to sign up directly to receive the materials. For more information about CHILD Profile, go to <https://www.doh.wa.gov/YouandYourFamily/Immunization/ChildProfileHealthPromotion/ForParents>.

Some local lead agencies reported local initiatives to increase child find in their counties. This included

- Collaborating with neonatal programs on building relationships and understanding to improve referral channels into early intervention.
- Developing memorandums of understanding with Early Head Start and other home visiting programs as a part of the State Systemic Improvement Plan efforts.
- King County, the state's largest county is working on a Developmental Screening initiative that resulted in 500 people trained on completing the ASQ. Those trained include a variety of early learning professionals and family members.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**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		85.00%	82.00%	90.00%	99.00%	97.60%	98.20%	96.50%	94.20%	96.67%	92.21%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	93.67%	91.90%

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
1,141	1,692	91.90%	100%	91.43%

  

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	406
---	-----

**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).**

Data were collected from July 1, 2017 through September 30, 2017 and was obtained from all IFSPs entered into the ESIT Data Management System (DMS) during this period.

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

The three months of data collected from all IFSPs during this period contained the full range of variability exhibited by the population served by ESIT throughout the year. The data is from all programs across the state making it representative of the entire state.

**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
130	130	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*

The ESIT program verified that it corrected all findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02.

ESIT staff, Local Lead Agency (LLA) administrators, Family Resources Coordinators (FRCs), and providers used the ESIT Data Management System (DMS) IFSP Compliance Report to review data.

From the date the LLA received a finding letter for noncompliance, the LLA had one year to correct identified non-compliance for each indicator not meeting 100%. Each LLA reviewed compliance reports from the DMS to ensure data was entered accurately into the system and that the regulatory requirements regarding timely service provision were being met.

To verify that noncompliance was correctly addressing the regulatory requirements, each LLA reviewed and identified a minimum of two weeks of DMS data. If data demonstrated compliance for each indicator where findings were issued, compliance was considered achieved. The LLA then submitted the DMS data to ESIT staff for reverification. After ESIT staff verified the data submitted, (and verified correction of individual child noncompliance, ESIT staff sent a letter documenting that noncompliance was fully corrected.

If correction of non-compliance has not been verified within one-year of the findings, ESIT staff notifies the LLA that they must develop a CAP. During FFY16, no LLA met the criteria for needing a CAP.

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

ESIT staff verified correction of each individual incidence of non-compliance through the ESIT data management system (DMS). The DMS provides a referral date, an Initial IFSP due date and the actual date the Initial IFSP was issued for every new IFSP. If an Initial IFSP was late, the DMS requires the user to enter a reason for the delay.

Late Exceptional Family Circumstance (EFC): extraordinary events that prevent the family from participating in required events on time.

Late Other: events identified by the early intervention program or provider and not the family that prevent required events from being completed on time.

ESIT staff reviewed compliance reports from the DMS during the annual compliance monitoring period and subsequent intervals as needed to verify each individual instance of noncompliance is corrected unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the local lead agency, the family declined services, or the local lead agency was unable to make contact with the family.

**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		76.00%	67.00%	96.00%	99.00%	99.80%	99.80%	100%	98.90%	100%	100%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	100%	100%

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
1,170	1,170	100%	100%	100%

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>	0
--	---

**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).**

Data were collected from July 1, 2017 through September 30, 2017 and was obtained from all IFSPs entered into the ESIT Data Management System (DMS) during this period.

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

The three months of data collected from all IFSPs during this period contained the full range of variability exhibited by the population served by ESIT throughout the year. The data is from all programs across the state making it representative of the entire state.

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

### 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
0	0	0	0

**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		95.00%	97.00%	99.00%	96.00%	99.70%	99.50%	100%	95.90%	100%	100%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	100%	100%

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
1,133	1,133	100%	100%	100%

<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>	0
---	---

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

The ESIT Data Management System (DMS) business rules requires local lead agencies (LLA) administrators, family resources coordinators (FRCs), and service providers to document in the DMS if a child was potentially eligible for Part B. ESIT, the state lead agency (SLA), generates notifications from the DMS to the state education agency(SEA) and local education agency (LEA).

**LEA Notification.** Potential eligibility for Part B special education documentation resulted in the DMS generating notifications. The DMS sent an automated electronic notification to all LEAs informing them of potentially eligible toddlers that would soon be transitioning from early intervention.

**SEA Notification.** ESIT staff manually sent the required notification to the SEA data manager. SEA and LEA notifications occur monthly. Because of the structure of the DMS, individual instances of noncompliance could not occur regarding this indicator.

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

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).

Data were collected from July 1, 2017 through September 30, 2017 and was obtained from all IFSPs entered into the ESIT Data Management System (DMS) during this period.

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

The three months of data collected from all IFSPs during this period contained the full range of variability exhibited by the population served by ESIT throughout the year. The data is from all programs across the state making it representative of the entire state.

### 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
0	0	0	0

**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		80.00%	76.00%	84.00%	98.00%	99.20%	98.80%	97.30%	96.90%	96.68%	96.92%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	95.48%	98.52%

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
917	1,133	98.52%	100%	96.96%

<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>	81
<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>	103

**Reasons for Slippage**

While maintaining a relatively high level of compliance, slippage occurred, resulting in a decrease of 1.56% between FFY2016 (98.52%) and FFY 2017 (96.96%).

Upon further data analysis, it was determined that slippage occurred mostly in three (3) counties. Two (2) of these counties had a significant increase in enrollment greater than 10 percent from the previous year.

Local lead agencies located in these counties reported an increased shortage of staff available to provider early intervention services and service coordination. One large county led a project to transition service coordination from school districts to provider agencies.

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

Other variables included local lead agencies developing and enhancing local referral systems to identify more eligible children. Some local lead agencies reported that service coordinators were struggling with scheduling transition conference with school district staff and meeting the timelines for late referrals.

We believe the slippage may have occurred due to an increased number of eligible children being identified, which challenged provider capacity to meet this requirement. Another assumption is that some programs need more guidance on Part C transition conference requirements.

ESIT staff is in the process of updating training and technical guidance on completing timely transition conferences including:

- Effective scheduling to meet timelines and appropriate documentation for late reasons (late other and exceptional family circumstances).
- Developing a timeline map that includes information about transition conference
- Provided targeted training and technical assistance to service coordinators
- Provide a training on transition at the local state conference in May
- Developing a transition practice guide

**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).**

Data were collected from July 1, 2017 through September 30, 2017 and was obtained from all IFSPs entered into the ESIT Data Management System (DMS) during this period.

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

The three months of data collected from all IFSPs during this period contained the full range of variability exhibited by the population served by ESIT throughout the year. The data is from all programs across the state making it representative of the entire state.

**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
14	14	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

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

The ESIT program verified that it corrected all findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02.

ESIT staff, Local Lead Agency (LLA) administrators, Family Resources Coordinators (FRCs), and providers used the ESIT Data Management System (DMS) IFSP Compliance Report to review data.

From the date the LLA received a finding letter for noncompliance, the LLA had one year to correct identified non-compliance for each indicator not meeting 100%. Each LLA reviewed compliance reports from the DMS to ensure data was entered accurately into the system and that the regulatory requirements regarding timely service provision were being met.

To verify that noncompliance was correctly addressing the regulatory requirements, each LLA reviewed and identified a minimum of two weeks of DMS data. If data demonstrated compliance for each indicator where findings were issued, compliance was considered achieved. The LLA then submitted the DMS data to ESIT staff for reverification. After ESIT staff verified the data submitted, (and verified correction of individual child noncompliance, ESIT staff sent a letter documenting that noncompliance was fully corrected.

If correction of non-compliance has not been verified within one-year of the findings, ESIT staff notifies the LLA that they must develop a CAP. During FFY16, no LLA met the criteria for needing a CAP.

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

ESIT staff verified correction of each individual incidence of non-compliance through the ESIT data management system (DMS). The DMS provides a transition conference due date and an actual date when the transition conference occurred for each child record required to have a transition conference. If a transition conference was late, the DMS requires the user to enter a reason for the delay.

Late Exceptional Family Circumstance (EFC): extraordinary events that prevent the family from participating in required events on time.

Late Other: events identified by the early intervention program or provider and not the family that prevent required events from being completed on time.

ESIT staff reviewed compliance reports from the DMS during the annual compliance monitoring period and subsequent intervals as needed to verify each individual instance of noncompliance is corrected unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the local lead agency, the family declined services, or the local lead agency was unable to make contact with the family.

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

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)

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data:

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 C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	<a href="#">3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</a>	n	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	<a href="#">3.1 Number of resolution sessions</a>	n	null

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
0	0			

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Washington State Part C has not adopted Part B procedural safeguards therefore resolutions sessions are not applicable to ESIT.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**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			

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

During FFY17, Washington State did not have any mediations.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**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: 2014

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target		56.25%	56.50%	56.70%	56.80%
Data	56.21%	56.38%			

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

**FFY 2018 Target**

FFY	2018
Target	58.25%

Key:

**Description of Measure**

The method used to collect data for this indicator is the Child Outcome Summary (COS) process. All infants and toddlers who have had an entry COS, and who have received at least six months of consecutive service will also have an exit COS completed. Entry COS data must be collected prior to completion of the initial IFSP. The exit COS data must be collected prior to the child's exit from early intervention. Rigorous Data Management business rules enforce both of these requirements. The IFSP and the COS rating processes are integrated. The ESIT Data Management System is programmed to gather and aggregate child outcome data and summary statement data. The number of COS ratings will continue to increase as the population of eligible infants and toddler increase. The baseline data and targets identified above are the same data and targets set for Indicator 3(a) Positive social-emotional skills and relationships.

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase I Stakeholder Involvement

SSIP Leadership Team included the Part C Coordinator, Part C Data Manager and Assistant Data Manager, Parent Participation Coordinator, Program Consultants, and Program Specialist.

ESIT staff received ongoing technical assistance and support from WRRC, ECTA, and DaSy staff throughout the process. They assisted with SSIP planning and facilitated leadership team conference calls.

In selecting leadership team members, ESIT staff gave preference to stakeholders that reported a working knowledge of IDEA, Part C data requirements and familiarity with Washington's State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR), the Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) process, and the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process. The capacity to engage in data analysis discussions was also highlighted. Thirteen individuals indicated an interest in participating on the leadership team. They were invited to join and consisted of six individuals representing early intervention local lead agencies throughout the state, five individuals representing early intervention service providers, one member from an educational service district, and one member representing child welfare. Three of the members indicated they were also parents of children with disabilities who received early intervention services.

The leadership team met by phone from April, 2014 to the present to share information and expertise related to Phase 1 SSIP required activities.

State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase II Stakeholder Involvement

In July of 2015, ESIT conducted an orientation to the leadership team to Phase II of the SSIP. A brief overview of Phase I was provided along with an introduction to Phase II. Following the orientation, the leadership team was divided into four action teams to address the four strands identified in the theory of action. Stakeholders made decisions as to which groups they would participate in, ensuring that each group consisted of individuals with knowledge and expertise in the particular topic. These strands include:

- Professional development for early intervention services
- Qualified personnel/partnerships and resources
- Assessment
- Accountability.

Each action team met monthly from August 2015 to December 2015 to the present to share information and expertise related to Phase II SSIP required activities.

**Overview**

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

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 attached document: Washington Part C SSIP 2015

### 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 attached document: Washington Part C SSIP 2015

### 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 Indicator 4 (helping their child develop and learn)).

#### Statement

See attached document: Washington Part C SSIP 2015

#### Description

See attached document: Washington Part C SSIP 2015

### 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 attached document: Washington Part C SSIP 2015

### 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)

### 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.

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

See attached: Washington Part C SSIP II 2016

### 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 attached: Washington Part C SSIP II 2016

### 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.

See attached: Washington Part C SSIP II 2016

### 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 attached: Washington Part C SSIP II 2016

### 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

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

See attached document: WA Part C SSIP Phase III Year 2 2018

### B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

- 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.
- 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 attached document: Washington Part C SSIP Phase III Year 2 2018

### C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

- 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
- 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
- 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 attached document: WA Part C SSIP Phase III Year 2 2018

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

- Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
- Implications for assessing progress or results
- Plans for improving data quality

See attached document: WA Part C SSIP Phase III Year 2 2018

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

### 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 attached document: WA Part C SSIP Phase III Year 2 2018

### 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 attached document: WA Part C SSIP Phase III Year 2 2018

**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: Judy King

Title: Director of Family Support Programs

Email: judy.king@dcyf.wa.gov

Phone: 360-725-2841