

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:  
Part C**

**for  
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS  
under the  
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act**

**For reporting on  
FFY18**

**Montana**



**PART C DUE February 3, 2020**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## Introduction

### Instructions

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

### Intro - Indicator Data

#### Executive Summary

The Montana Department of Public Health and Human Services (DPHHS) is the State lead agency that has the responsibility for administering and overseeing the statewide system of early intervention services, Montana Milestones Part C Early Intervention Program. The State currently contracts with five regional agencies to provide the Program in their geographic catchment areas to infants and toddlers who are experiencing developmental delays or at risk for developmental delays due to an established condition diagnosed by a physician or psychologist. In FFY 2018, Montana served 1247 children, of which 700 were enrolled with Individual Family Service Plans (IFSP). The Montana annual budget for early intervention is \$5,173,159 which includes the Part C of the IDEA federal grant (\$2,301,492) and legislatively-allocated State General Funds (\$2,871,867). The five regional contracts total \$4,497,207 for the provision of the following:

1. Referral System to ensure infants and toddlers suspected of having a developmental delay or disability can be easily referred to the early intervention program and all eligible children are enrolled.
2. Multidisciplinary evaluations to determine a child's initial and subsequent eligibility; multidisciplinary assessment initially and at least annually to determine the child's unique needs and the early intervention services appropriate to address those needs; and assessment of the family members to identify the resources, concerns, and priorities of the family related to the development of the child.
3. Individual Family Service Plan developed by the multidisciplinary team.
4. Individualized services under public supervision to meet the developmental needs of the child and the needs of the family related to enhancing the child's development.
5. Service Coordination provided to a child and family via, at a minimum, one monthly face to face meeting.
6. Procedural safeguards accorded to children and families receiving services.
7. Transition from the Part C of the IDEA Program.

The mission of Montana Milestones Part C Early Intervention Program is to build upon and provide supports and resources to assist family members and caregivers to enhance children's learning and development through everyday learning opportunities. In order to ensure the quality of services provided to children and families enrolled in the Program and to comply with federal and State requirements through monitoring and professional development activities, Montana Milestones developed its General Supervision System to promote the Program's mission, key principles and core values. Montana Milestones State Systemic Improvement Plan supports this effort by focusing on areas of lower performance with a systemic improvement approach. The Program utilizes information from the most recent Annual Performance Plan (APR) data from Indicators 1-8 to make determinations annually on the performance of each region. Information from the State's database, the Early Intervention Module, the regional agencies' annual reporting, and the State's Dispute Resolution Process is used as criteria in making regional determinations. Each regional contractor receives a determination of "meets requirements," "needs assistance, or "needs intervention."

#### 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 focuses upon individualized support to identify practices that lead to compliant and high-quality services; identifying commendable practices; and identifying and enforcing corrective action plans in areas of non-compliance.

Required Part C of the IDEA processes and high-quality performance measures are identified within each regional contract:

1. Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report to evaluate efforts to implement the requirements and purposes of Part C.
2. State-wide Systemic Improvement Plan, a comprehensive multi-year plan focusing upon improving results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
3. Public awareness and Child Find System to identify, locate, and evaluate infants and toddlers with disabilities who are eligible for early intervention services including Indian infants and toddlers residing on a reservation geographically located in the region(s) as well as infants and toddlers who are homeless, in foster care, and wards of the State.
4. Use of funds and resources efficiently and effectively to implement a high-quality program for meeting the needs of children and families enrolled in Part C of the IDEA.
5. Collection and analysis of performance data to make decisions.
6. Implementation of quality standards which are consistent with professional practice guidance and identified in the most current version of Montana's Stepping Stones for Early Intervention Success.
7. Build and sustain a high-quality intervention program following timelines and implementing supervisory oversight and accurate data entry.
8. Develop, write, and implement high-quality child and family outcomes following regulatory requirements.
9. Follow dispute resolution procedures for Part C of the IDEA.

The Part C Coordinator provides administrative oversight and monitoring of all regional Programs. The purpose of monitoring is to a) monitor and evaluate regional compliance with the federal Part C of the IDEA regulations; b) monitor the regional contractor's compliance to ensure eligible children and families receive timely, comprehensive, community-based services that enhance the developmental progress of children from birth to age three; c) monitor and evaluate the regional contractor's contract activities; d) contribute to ongoing quality improvement of regional contractors to ensure a baseline of quality services for all families participating in Montana Milestones. There are 5 components of the monitoring system: 1) regional contractors' annual report; 2) data verification process; 3) dispute resolution system; 4) regional contractors' determinations; and 5) technical assistance and/or professional development. **Focused on-site visits at the five regions is expected to be an additional monitoring activity in FFY 2019 as the Part C staff will expand: the Part C Coordinator and a data quality specialist.**

1. Annual Report: the regional contractors submit annual reporting on each Indicator every year. This is a key piece of data gathering for federal and State reporting requirements, the federal Indicators, and includes Indicator 11, the State-wide Systemic Improvement Plan. The results are used to make the regional determinations. A corrective action plan is requested to address any issues of non-compliance identified through the annual report and submitted to the Part C Coordinator within 30 days of written notification.

2. Data verification: throughout the year, activities are completed by the Part C Coordinator to verify the reliability, accuracy and timeliness of data reported by the regional contractors to DPHHS. Several methods are utilized such as the reporting features of the State's database and ongoing Leadership Team meetings with the five regions to review data.
3. Dispute resolution: the Part C Coordinator oversees the Part C of the IDEA dispute resolution process. The Coordinator supports families and regional contractors to access the Part C procedural safeguard system; provide technical assistance to the regional contractors on the implementation of the procedural safeguards, and completes Part C formal investigations within federal timelines. Written complaints are investigated to determine whether there are any findings of non-compliance with IDEA. **The DPHHS Office of Legal Affairs provides consultation and the Coordinator sends a written response to the family and the regional contractor within 60 days of the complaint.** If an area of non-compliance is identified, a corrective action plan is required of the regional contractor and the contractor has one year from the notification of noncompliance to come into compliance. The regional contractor must submit the corrective action plan to the Part C Coordinator within identified timelines. The Part C Coordinator reviews and approves the plan and develops a follow-up monitoring plan as appropriate. Any areas of non-compliance must be corrected within one year from the written notification.
4. Regional contractors' determinations: In making determinations, the Part C Coordinator uses both the compliance and results Indicators. The Coordinator utilizes information from the State's database, and annual report, and the dispute resolution system as criteria in making regional determinations. Each contractor receives a determination of "meets requirements," "needs assistance," or "needs intervention" based on compliance with Part C of the IDEA.

#### **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.**

Montana utilized the Office of Special Education Program's technical assistance teams from WestEd/NCSI, IDC, DaSy, ECTA, and the National Center for Pyramid Model Innovations. The Part C Coordinator and specific representatives from the five regional contractors participate in cross-state learning collaboratives: Part C Results-Based Accountability, Pyramid Model and the Part C SSIP, and the ITCA Fiscal Cohort. Montana's Part C Coordinator and the Parent Chair of the ICC participated in ECPC's Leadership Cohorts. Additionally, Montana is part of two learning communities: CADRE/ECTA Part C and Child Outcomes Summary Process.

The Part C Coordinator makes available ongoing support and technical assistance on-demand and via Leadership Team meetings. All types of technical assistance are intended to increase the knowledge, skills, and effectiveness of the recipients. The actions taken because of the technical assistance received:

1. Reorientation to the regulatory requirements found around multidisciplinary evaluation, assessment and teams. This resulted in revised guidance, process and procedures, training, and revisions to the State's database to incorporate documentation of multidisciplinary evaluation, assessment, and teams.
2. Reorientation to the regulatory requirements pertaining to eligibility and the State's definition of eligibility. This resulted in an eligibility flowchart guidance document, an established condition list, eligibility approval by the Part C Coordinator as submitted in the State's database, and training.
3. Reorientation to the regulatory requirements pertaining to General Supervision. This ongoing guidance is provided to the Leadership Team documenting General Supervision activities and contractual language, assurances included in the Part C Grant Application, the State's policies and procedures to meet the regulatory requirements, the Part C of the IDEA regulations and requirements (CFR 300) and the State's Administrative Rules.
4. Letters of determination including validation procedures to ensure the regulatory requirements are being met.
5. Fiscal analysis tools for regional contractors to formulate budget and cost estimates to support plans, programs, and activities. The State expects the analysis to provide recommendations about costs and benefits of alternative methods for financing each region's program and administrative operations. Additionally, each regional contractor is collecting data regarding Medicaid reimbursement for early intervention services as identified on the IFSP.
6. Development of Social-Emotional Framework including service coordinator practices to enhance family members' responsiveness and sensitivity leading to improved positive social-emotional skills.
7. Refining the State's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) to reflect up-to-date knowledge-base and evidence-based standards of practice for Service Coordinators leading to high-quality intervention and improved results for children and families. The CSPD will lead to primary and comprehensive certification as issued by Montana's Early Childhood Practitioner Registry.
8. Improved child outcomes data quality to advance the State's SSIP goals.

#### **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.**

Montana Milestones previously adopted the State's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development developed by Montana's Office of Public Instruction. In recent years, the Part C Coordinator has worked extensively with Montana State University to develop an online professional development system to promote systemic, consistent, and on-demand professional development pertaining to early intervention in Montana. Four modules were created and an additional six more were developed. Review of the current and newly developed modules with Montana's technical assistance providers and representatives from Montana State University led the Program to develop a year-long plan to enhance the CSPD to deliver high-quality and engaging professional development. The first steps will be focused on stakeholder involvement to build consensus for developing the content and action steps for developing the CSPD. The plan will be described in more detail in the State's SSIP. Montana continues to seek professional development targeting the SSIP improvement strategies leading to improved child and family outcome results.

#### **Stakeholder Involvement:**

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

Montana's stakeholders have been informed of the progress of the SPP/APR Indicators throughout the year and their input and guidance has been critical in identifying improvement strategies. The State's two major stakeholder groups are the Family Support Services Advisory Council - the FSSAC - (Montana's ICC) and the Leadership Team made up of the five regional agency directors and their chosen staff members. These groups provide significant input on the development of the APR/SPP including the SSIP through various communication methods: face-to-face meetings, monthly virtual meetings, presentations via Skype, and work groups. The Council meets at least four times annually, face-to-face, and virtually as needed. They advise and assist the State in embedding child and family outcomes into everyday practice and are utilized as the core Stakeholder group to assist the lead agency in identifying an improvement focus. Two parent representatives from the FSSAC are participating in the ECPC's Family Leadership Cohort and are partnering with Montana State University early childhood education personnel to implement work plans promoting the use of family stories as part of ongoing training and undergraduate coursework in the early childhood field. More information on this will be provided in the State's SSIP. The Leadership Team meets monthly to provide input throughout the year. Two of their significant actions this year were contributions to the development of the Established Condition list and the revised IFSP embedding eligibility documentation for inclusion in the State's database. An additional work group made up of a sub-group of the Leadership Team has been instrumental in developing the Social-Emotional Framework and the ingraining of social-emotional practices within each home visit expecting to lead to positive changes in child and family outcomes.

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

NO

**Reporting to the Public:**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2017 performance of each EIS Program located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2017 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, is available.**

Montana Milestones Part C Early Intervention Program's FFY 2018 APR/SPP will be available on the Department's website as soon as possible after February 3, 2020:

<https://dphhs.mt.gov/dsd/developmentaldisabilities/montanamilestones/partcreports>.

The FFY 2018 APR/SPP will also be available on the regional contractors' websites as soon as possible after February 3, 2020.

The FFY 2018 APR/SPP is reported to the Governor as soon as possible after February 3, 2020.

The dissemination of the regional contractors' FFY 2018 APR/SPP and Letters of Determination will be posted to the Department's website as soon as possible after April 1, 2020 and posted to each individual contractor's website as soon as possible after April 1, 2020.

**Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

**Intro - OSEP Response**

**Intro - Required Actions**

# Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

## Instructions and Measurement

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

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Family Service Plans(IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Include the State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

### Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services, including the reasons for delays.

### Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select early intervention service (EIS) programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. States report in both the numerator and denominator under Indicator 1 on the number of children for whom the State ensured the timely initiation of new services identified on the IFSP. Include the timely initiation of new early intervention services from both initial IFSPs and subsequent IFSPs. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

The State's timeliness measure for this indicator must be either: (1) a time period that runs from when the parent consents to IFSP services; or (2) the IFSP initiation date (established by the IFSP Team, including the parent).

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2005	100.00%			
<b>FFY</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	97.84%	99.88%	100.00%	100.00%

### Targets

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>
Target	100%	100%

### FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
294	345	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

### 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.*

**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).**

Montana's definition of timely receipt of early intervention services is identified as services are initiated within 30 days from when the parent/family member provides consent (date stamped signature page of the initial IFSP captured in the State's database) to the early intervention services and supports identified within the initial IFSP.

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

State database

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

XXX

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

The statistically valid, randomized sample size was from the full reporting period: July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.

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

Each of Montana's five contractors was provided an Indicator 1 spreadsheet with a statistically valid, randomized sample of initial IFSPs completed for the reporting period of July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019 taken from the State's database report, Timely Services. For each initial IFSP record identified in the sample, the agency's personnel documented the early intervention service(s) identified on the named IFSP and noted the date the service(s) were initiated. If the service was not initiated within 30 days, the agency's personnel documented reasons for delay. The agency additionally documented the source of the service initiation data. To ensure the data source was verifiable (valid and reliable), the Part C Coordinator also performed randomized checks of the Indicator 1 data submitted by each agency. The report from the State's database used for Indicator 1 reporting is being refined and will link with the Service Coordinator's case notes beginning in July 2020.

**If needed, provide additional information about this indicator here.**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

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 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because of the discrepancy explained in the OSEP Response above, it was unclear if the State identified any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, despite the State reporting that its data was 100%. If the findings in question were in fact from FFY 2016, the State must provide an explanation in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR of why it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

Montana was required to report on the correction of 14 findings of non-compliance identified in the State's FFY 2015 Annual Performance Reporting. This was expected to be included in the State's Annual Performance Report for FFY 2016 and again in FFY 2017. In the State's Annual Performance Report for FFY 2017, the 14 findings of non-compliance were erroneously identified as 14 findings of non-compliance from FFY 2016 by the Part C Coordinator. Montana's Indicator 1 data for FFY 2016 had zero records out of compliance.

The 14 records identified in FFY 2015 were due to agency circumstances and the deeper data drill-down noted that the services were initiated in each of the 14 cases within 38 to 48 days after consent was provided by the family member. Specific strategies including general supervision activities were implemented to ensure the regulatory requirements were met: 1) training for each contractor on the regulatory requirements and the functionality of the date-stamp in the State's database; 2) each agency developed and implemented monitoring strategies to ensure compliance with the Indicator; and 3) increased monitoring by the Part C Coordinator throughout the course of the year to ensure the regulatory requirements were being met.

Indicator 1 data compiled since FFY 2015 indicates the regulatory requirements are being met throughout the State including verifiable documentation of those records with services initiated outside of the 30 day timeline as attributable to exceptional circumstances. Agencies are expected to provide annual training using the guidance document for both IFSP and COSP processes. The agencies document the annual training and its participants in the annual training plans.

**1 - OSEP Response**

**1 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	90.70%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target>=	97.00%	97.00%	98.00%	98.00%	99.00%
Data	99.73%	99.30%	99.72%	99.32%	99.41%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=	99.00%	99.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Along with administrative team members, two stakeholder groups participated in reviewing Indicator 2 data and the target. Stakeholder Group 1 is made up of the State's Inter-agency Coordinating Council, the Family Support Services Advisory Council. The 26 members representing family members, early intervention service providers, five regional contractors, Early Head Start/Head Start, the Early Childhood Bureau, Children's Special Health Services, Child and Family Services, Medicaid Programs, Home Visiting, Higher Education, MT School for the Deaf and Blind, 619/Part B Coordinator, Special Education Preschool Director, and a Legislative Representative. The team reviewed the Indicator 2 data during a meeting held January 10, 2020. They suggested maintaining the current target. Stakeholder Group 2 is made up of the leaders from the five regional contractors including each agency's director and their handpicked Leadership Team members. This group reviewed the Indicator 2 data at two meetings: January 10, 2020 and January 15, 2020. They, too, suggested maintaining the current target.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	838
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	842

### FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
838	842	99.41%	99.00%	99.52%	Met Target	No Slippage

### Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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



**2 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

**2 - OSEP Response**

**2 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

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

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

**Summary Statement 1:** Of those infants and toddlers who entered early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

#### Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in category (d)) divided by ((# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

#### Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e)) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

#### Instructions

**Sampling of infants and toddlers with IFSPs** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement, include in the numerator and denominator only infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

**Report:** (1) the number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's Part C exiting data under Section 618 of the IDEA; and (2) the number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements.

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Process (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

If the State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i), the State must report data in two ways. First, it must report on all eligible children but exclude its at-risk infants and toddlers (i.e., include just those infants and toddlers experiencing developmental delay (or "developmentally delayed children") or having a diagnosed physical or mental condition that has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay (or "children with diagnosed conditions")). Second, the State must separately report outcome data on either: (1) just its at-risk infants and toddlers; or (2) aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C (including developmentally delayed children, children with diagnosed conditions, and at-risk infants and toddlers).

### 3 - Indicator Data

Does your State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? (yes/no)

NO

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Along with administrative team members, two stakeholder groups participated in reviewing Indicator 3 data and targets. Stakeholder Group 1 is made up of the State's Inter-agency Coordinating Council, the Family Support Services Advisory Council. The 26 members represent family members, early intervention service providers, the five regional contractors, Early Head Start/Head Start, the Early Childhood Bureau, Children's Special Health Services, Child and Family Services, Medicaid Programs, Home Visiting, Higher Education, MT School for the Deaf and Blind, 619/Part B Coordinator, Special Education Preschool Director, and a Legislative Representative. The team formally reviewed the Indicator 3 data during a meeting held January 10, 2020. Noting the ongoing results of successfully implemented strategies intended to improve the quality of Montana's child outcomes data, the group suggested revising the baseline and targets based upon the upcoming FFY 2019 outcomes data reflecting more valid data collected. Stakeholder Group 2 is made up of the leaders from the five regional contractors including each agency's director and their handpicked Leadership Team members. This group reviewed the Indicator 3 data at multiple times throughout the year as Child Outcomes Quality is one of the State's SSIP improvement strategies. Following three meetings: January 10, 2020, January 15, 2020, and January 28, 2020; they, too, suggested revising the baselines using FFY 2019 data to be more reflective of better quality child outcomes data. Please see "additional information" for a description of the State's efforts to provide high quality child outcomes data and its future impact on the State's FFY 2019 baseline and target settings.

#### Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2008	Target>=	59.00%	59.00%	62.00%	65.00%	65.00%
A1	62.00%	Data	71.91%	66.11%	62.72%	53.42%	64.94%
A2	2008	Target>=	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	56.00%	56.00%
A2	55.80%	Data	63.02%	53.04%	48.07%	35.22%	44.14%
B1	2008	Target>=	61.00%	61.00%	61.00%	64.00%	64.00%
B1	63.50%	Data	71.99%	69.59%	64.21%	55.72%	66.67%
B2	2008	Target>=	44.00%	44.00%	44.00%	47.00%	47.00%
B2	46.80%	Data	55.74%	42.27%	38.41%	30.73%	36.66%
C1	2008	Target>=	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%	70.00%	70.00%
C1	70.10%	Data	72.71%	65.16%	66.48%	59.08%	67.03%
C2	2008	Target>=	52.00%	52.00%	52.00%	55.00%	55.00%
C2	54.30%	Data	64.48%	53.87%	51.45%	35.93%	39.90%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1>=	68.00%	68.00%
Target A2>=	59.00%	59.00%
Target B1>=	67.00%	67.00%
Target B2>=	50.00%	50.00%
Target C1>=	73.00%	73.00%
Target C2>=	58.00%	58.00%

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

460

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	6	1.30%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	144	31.30%

	Number of children	Percentage of Total
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	125	27.17%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	128	27.83%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	57	12.39%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	253	403	64.94%	68.00%	62.78%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	185	460	44.14%	59.00%	40.22%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable**

Since 2013 and following significant drill-down into Child Outcomes measurement processes and procedures across the State, Montana implemented strategies to ensure the validity and reliability of Child Outcomes Summary Statements for all three Child Outcomes: 1) use of a single measurement tool, the MEISR, to be used for age-anchoring across the State; 2) development of consistent COS process to be implemented during every baseline and exit measurement across the State; 3) inclusion of family input during baseline and exit ratings; 4) ongoing monitoring of Child Outcomes data; 5) required annual training on the COS process; 6) annual COSP fidelity checklist; and 7) follow-up training to those not meeting the fidelity threshold. The result of the strategies has been percentage decreases in each Summary Statement. Therefore, the State attributes the slippage to improved COS processes and procedures resulting in more reliable and valid Child Outcomes summary statements data.

**Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable**

Same as identified above.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	8	1.74%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	157	34.13%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	144	31.30%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	121	26.30%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	30	6.52%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	265	430	66.67%	67.00%	61.63%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	151	460	36.66%	50.00%	32.83%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable**

Since 2013 and following significant drill-down into Child Outcomes measurement processes and procedures across the State, the State implemented strategies to ensure the validity and reliability of Child Outcomes Summary Statements for all three Child Outcomes: 1) use of a single measurement tool, the MEISR, to be used for age-anchoring across the State; 2) development of consistent COS process to be implemented during every baseline and exit measurement across the State; 3) inclusion of family input during baseline and exit ratings; 4) ongoing monitoring of Child Outcomes data; 5) required annual training on the COS process; 6) annual COSP fidelity checklist; and 7) follow-up training to those not meeting the fidelity threshold. The result of the strategies has been percentage decreases in each Summary Statement. Therefore, the State attributes the slippage to improved COS processes and procedures resulting in more reliable and valid Child Outcomes summary statements data.

**Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable**

Same as identified above.

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	6	1.30%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	153	33.26%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	122	26.52%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	132	28.70%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	47	10.22%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	254	413	67.03%	73.00%	61.50%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	179	460	39.90%	58.00%	38.91%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable**

Since 2013 and following significant drill-down into Child Outcomes measurement processes and procedures across the State, the State implemented strategies to ensure the validity and reliability of Child Outcomes Summary Statements for all three Child Outcomes: 1) use of a single measurement tool, the MEISR, to be used for age-anchoring across the State; 2) development of consistent COS process to be implemented during every baseline and exit measurement across the State; 3) inclusion of family input during baseline and exit ratings; 4) ongoing monitoring of Child Outcomes data; 5) required annual training on the COS process; 6) annual COSP fidelity checklist; and 7) follow-up training to those not meeting the fidelity threshold. The result of the strategies has been percentage decreases in each Summary Statement. Therefore, the State attributes the slippage to improved COS processes and procedures resulting in more reliable and valid Child Outcomes summary statements data.

**Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Will your separate report be just the at-risk infants and toddlers or aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C?**

XXX

**Historical Data**

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A1	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A1 AR	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A1 AR	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A2	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

<b>A2</b>	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
<b>A2 AR</b>	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
<b>A2 AR</b>	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
<b>B1</b>	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
<b>B1</b>	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
<b>B1 AR</b>	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
<b>B1 AR</b>	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
<b>B2</b>	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
<b>B2</b>	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
<b>B2 AR</b>	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
<b>B2 AR</b>	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
<b>C1</b>	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
<b>C1</b>	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
<b>C1 AR</b>	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
<b>C1 AR</b>	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
<b>C2</b>	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
<b>C2</b>	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
<b>C2 AR</b>	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
<b>C2 AR</b>	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

**Targets**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>
Target A1 >=	XXX	XXX
A1 AR	XXX	
Target A2 >=	XXX	XXX
A2 AR	XXX	XXX
Target B1 >=	XXX	XXX
B1 AR	XXX	XXX
Target B2 >=	XXX	XXX
B2 AR	XXX	XXX
Target C1 >=	XXX	XXX
C1 AR	XXX	XXX
Target C2 >=	XXX	XXX
C2 AR	XXX	XXX

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

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

XXX

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

<b>Not including at-risk infants and toddlers</b>	<b>Number of children</b>	<b>Percentage of Total</b>
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	XXX	XXX
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	XXX	XXX
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX

<b>Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers</b>	<b>Number of children</b>	<b>Percentage of Total</b>
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	XXX	XXX
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	XXX	XXX
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX

<b>Not including at-risk infants and toddlers</b>	<b>Numerator</b>	<b>Denominator</b>	<b>FFY 2017 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
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	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
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	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

**Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable**

XXX

<b>Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers</b>	<b>Numerator</b>	<b>Denominator</b>	<b>FFY 2017 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
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	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
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	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

**Provide reasons for A1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable**

XXX

Provide reasons for A2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	XXX	XXX
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	XXX	XXX
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	XXX	XXX
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	XXX	XXX
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
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	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX



<b>Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers</b>	<b>Numerator</b>	<b>Denominator</b>	<b>FFY 2017 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program							

**Provide reasons for B1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Provide reasons for B2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

<b>Not including at-risk infants and toddlers</b>	<b>Number of Children</b>	<b>Percentage of Total</b>
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	XXX	XXX
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	XXX	XXX
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX

<b>Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers</b>	<b>Number of Children</b>	<b>Percentage of Total</b>
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	XXX	XXX
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	XXX	XXX
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX

<b>Not including at-risk infants and toddlers</b>	<b>Numerator</b>	<b>Denominator</b>	<b>FFY 2017 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
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	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
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	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

**Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable**

XXX

<b>Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers</b>	<b>Numerator</b>	<b>Denominator</b>	<b>FFY 2017 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program							
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	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

**Provide reasons for C1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Provide reasons for C2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**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	820
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.	216

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If the plan has changed, please provide sampling plan.	

**Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.**

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

YES

**Provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers."**

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

Each contractor follows the Child Outcomes Summaries Process Guidance developed in 2016 and revised in 2017. The Guidance includes six learning modules beginning with 1) an overview of the COS process including MEISR training; 2) essential knowledge for the COS process including age expected skills and behaviors; 3) 7-point rating scale; 4) using the rating scale during case studies, i.e., bucket tree; 5) engaging families in the COS process; and 6) documenting the ratings. Annual training is required for each service coordinator as well as meeting the COS Fidelity Checklist threshold: 85%.

The State's database stores all baseline and exit COS along with Child Outcome Analysis reports: Child Outcomes Summary (report on the Part C totals for each of the OSEP reporting categories) and Child Outcome Analysis Reports (reports on infants and toddlers exiting Part C comparing baseline and exit outcomes, entry distributions, exit distributions, entry and exit distributions). The reporting features are available on demand with current data and have contributed significantly to identifying adjustments and improvement strategies throughout the course of the fiscal year. A new report was created in FFY 2017 and was used this fiscal year to identify those children exiting Part C within six months.

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

Montana's intense efforts to provide high quality child outcomes data has been worthwhile. Ongoing monitoring by the Part C Coordinator as well as the five regional contractors indicates that pursuing a change in the State's baselines along with resetting targets are our next steps following the FFY 2019 data collection period. Montana proposes to set new baselines and targets using actual FFY 2019 outcomes data in the anticipated new APR package available in FFY 2020. Continuous monitoring and improvement processes are in place and will be highlighted in Montana's SSIP submission in April 2020.

**3 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

**3 - OSEP Response**

### 3 - Required Actions

## Indicator 4: Family Involvement

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

#### Instructions

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

Report the number of families to whom the surveys were distributed.

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

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

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

## 4 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2006	Target >=	93.00%	93.00%	94.00%	94.00%	95.00%
A	93.00%	Data	93.72%	95.94%	88.98%	84.64%	74.52%
B	2006	Target >=	93.00%	93.00%	94.00%	94.00%	95.00%
B	92.80%	Data	94.49%	95.65%	91.67%	91.87%	78.56%
C	2006	Target >=	88.00%	93.00%	94.00%	94.00%	95.00%
C	94.80%	Data	93.70%	95.34%	87.63%	85.93%	73.89%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	95.00%	95.00%
Target B >=	95.00%	95.00%
Target C >=	95.00%	95.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Along with the Department's administrative team, two stakeholder groups participated in reviewing Indicator 4 data and the targets. Stakeholder Group 1 is made up of the State's Inter-agency Coordinating Council, the Family Support Services Advisory Council. The 26 members representing family members, early intervention service providers, the five regional contractors, Early Head Start/Head Start, the Early Childhood Bureau, Children's Special Health Services, Child and Family Services, Medicaid Programs, Home Visiting, Higher Education, MT School for the Deaf and Blind, 619/Part B Coordinator, Special Education Preschool Director, and a Legislative Representative. The team reviewed the Indicator 4 data during a meeting held

January 10, 2020. They suggested maintaining the current targets. Stakeholder Group 2 is made up of the leaders from the five regional contractors including each agency's director and their handpicked Leadership Team members. This group reviewed the Indicator 2 data at two meetings: January 10, 2020 and January 15, 2020. They, too, suggested maintaining the current targets.

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	677
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	456
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	428
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	454
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	436
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	454
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	425
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	452

	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2)	74.52%	95.00%	94.27%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2)	78.56%	95.00%	96.04%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2)	73.89%	95.00%	94.03%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for part A slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Provide reasons for part B slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Provide reasons for part C slippage, if applicable**

XXX

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If the plan has changed, please provide the sampling plan.	

**Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.**

	Yes / No
Was a collection tool used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised collection tool?	NO
If your collection tool has changed, upload it here	XXX
The demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.	YES

**If not, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

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

Montana began implementing an improvement plan at pilot sites: the Family Outcomes Survey Process, based upon the previous year's data analysis and developed by a stakeholder group made up of representatives from each regional contractor. The five regional agencies received written guidance

regarding the process that includes talking points to engage the family about the Family Survey upon entry to the Part C Program by the intake professional; additional talking points to engage the family about the Family Survey for the service coordinator in the month before the child's six month review; and then providing the Family Survey in either written format or by accessing the online Survey at the Montana Milestones website during the six month review meeting. Full implementation across all five regions began in FFY 2019. The expectation is that every family in the Program will have the opportunity to complete the Survey (anonymously) at the child's six month review in the most convenient way for them: paper and pencil or via the online Survey. The intentional structure has the potential to provide the Program with family outcomes data, from families enrolled since birth, three times over the course of enrollment. Additionally, results expected also include increased representation of the demographics of the families enrolled in the Part C Program. Thus far, the implementation for FFY 2018 results demonstrate increases in Survey responses including infants and toddlers enrolled in the Program and living on Montana's reservations (the second largest ethnicity in Montana). Return rates for the specific regions including the reservations represented:

Region 1 = 89% return rate (includes Fort Peck Reservation, Northern Cheyenne Reservation, part of Fort Belknap Reservation, part of Crow Reservation, and part of Turtle Mountain Reservation);

Region 2 = 61% return rate (includes Blackfeet Nation, Rocky Boy Reservation, part of Fort Belknap Reservation; Little Chippewa/Shell tribes);

Region 3 = 57%\* return rate (part of Crow Reservation),

Region 4 = 73% return rate; and

Region 5\*\* = 35% return rate (Flathead Reservation).

\*Region 3 return rate increased 4% from FFY 2017.

\*\*Region 5 return rate increased 9% from FFY 2017.

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

#### **4 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

#### **4 - OSEP Response**

#### **4 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

### Instructions and Measurement

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

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

## 5 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	1.33%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	1.39%	1.43%	1.43%	1.46%	1.46%
Data	1.07%	1.15%	1.07%	0.99%	1.19%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	1.46%	1.46%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Along with the Department's administrative team, two stakeholder groups participated in reviewing Indicator 5 data and the target. Stakeholder Group 1 is made up of the State's Inter-agency Coordinating Council, the Family Support Services Advisory Council. The 26 members representing family members, early intervention service providers, the five regional contractors, Early Head Start/Head Start, the Early Childhood Bureau, Children's Special Health Services, Child and Family Services, Medicaid Programs, Home Visiting, Higher Education, MT School for the Deaf and Blind, 619/Part B Coordinator, Special Education Preschool Director, and a Legislative Representative. The team reviewed the Indicator 5 data during a meeting held January 10, 2020. They suggested maintaining the current target. Stakeholder Group 2 is made up of the leaders from the five regional contractors including each agency's director and their handpicked Leadership Team members. This group reviewed the Indicator 5 data at two meetings: January 10, 2020 and January 15, 2020. They, too, suggested maintaining the current target.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	150
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/20/2019	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	12,099

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
150	12,099	1.19%	1.46%	1.24%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

### Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

### Compare your results to the national data

Montana's results for FFY 2018 increased minimally (.05%) thus serving 1.24% of infants and toddlers, birth to one, with IFSPs compared to the national data, 1.5% of infants and toddlers, birth to one, with IFSPs.

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

**5 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

**5 - OSEP Response**

**5 - Required Actions**



## Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

### Instructions and Measurement

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

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

### 6 - Indicator Data

Baseline	2005	2.21%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	2.14%	2.14%	2.20%	2.20%	2.20%
Data	1.97%	2.23%	1.93%	2.34%	2.21%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	2.25%	2.25%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Along with the Department's administrative team, two stakeholder groups participated in reviewing Indicator 6 data and the target. Stakeholder Group 1 is made up of the State's Inter-agency Coordinating Council, the Family Support Services Advisory Council. The 26 members representing family members, early intervention service providers, the five regional contractors, Early Head Start/Head Start, the Early Childhood Bureau, Children's Special Health Services, Child and Family Services, Medicaid Programs, Home Visiting, Higher Education, MT School for the Deaf and Blind, 619/Part B Coordinator, Special Education Preschool Director, and a Legislative Representative. The team reviewed the Indicator 6 data during a meeting held January 10, 2020. They suggested maintaining the current target. Stakeholder Group 2 is made up of the leaders from the five regional contractors including each agency's director and their handpicked Leadership Team members. This group reviewed the Indicator 6 data at two meetings: January 10, 2020 and January 15, 2020. They, too, suggested maintaining the current target.

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	842
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/20/2019	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	36,944

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
842	36,944	2.21%	2.25%	2.28%	Met Target	No Slippage

#### Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

#### Compare your results to the national data

Montana's results indicate a minimal increase in FFY 2018 (.07%) thus serving 2.28% of infants and toddlers, birth to three, with IFSPs compared to the national data, 2.3% of infants and toddlers, birth to three, with IFSPs. Since contractual payment for each of the regional contractors is based upon meeting regional Child Counts was implemented in 2016-2017, Montana's child count results have improved. General supervision activities to ensure infants and toddlers were meeting the State's definition of eligibility have validated the reliability of the child count data.

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

### 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**6 - OSEP Response**

**6 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

### Instructions and Measurement

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

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must address the timeline from point of referral to initial IFSP meeting based on actual, not an average, number of days.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.

#### Instructions

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

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 7 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	100.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	96.52%	93.09%	99.51%	99.51%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

### FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
777	864	99.51%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

87

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

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

Data was collected for the full reporting period: July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.

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

Visual data prompts and validation procedures embedded into the State's database include;

1. 45-day timeline countdown is depicted on both the pending initial IFSP and the message center for each service coordinator and his/her supervisor;
2. Prior to completion of the pending initial IFSP, the service coordinator is required to explain the reason for delay beginning on the 46th day; and
3. The date-stamp of the completed initial IFSP.

The State's database provides a report, the IFSP Status Report, which specifies the Part C initial IFSP completion status within the 45 day limit. All contractors have access to this report on-demand to support their ongoing monitoring efforts. During the data collection period for Indicator 7, 43/87 records contained insufficient documentation to determine if the regulatory requirements were met. At the request of the Part C Coordinator, each contractor provided additional documentation supporting why the 45-day timeline did not apply attributable to exceptional family circumstances. Three of the five regional contractors had 10 or more records needing additional documentation to ensure delays were attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

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

For those contractors with 10 or more records necessitating additional documentation to determine if the regulatory requirements were met, each will be required to provide technical assistance to service coordinators regarding appropriate documentation and provide the results of the assistance for FFY 2019.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
10	10	0	0

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Region "A" identified 8 records as non-compliant for failure to meet the regulatory requirements. The Part C Coordinator requested verification data of the timeline of the 8 records and interviewed the agency's administrator. The agency's analysis identified all 8 instances were attributable to two service coordinators at the agency. The individuals received corrective action plans along with additional training and support. One service coordinator left employment with the agency and the second service coordinator has been successful in implementing the regulatory requirements. The agency submitted updated data (25 records) for review by the Part C Coordinator. The results of the reviews indicate the agency is implementing the regulatory requirements successfully.

Region "B" identified 2 records as non-compliant due to insufficient information to determine if an exceptional family circumstance caused the delay. The Part C Coordinator requested verification data of the timeline of the 2 records and interviewed the agency's administrator. The agency attributed the delay due to the service coordinators' incomplete documentation procedures. The agency submitted updated data (26 records) for review by the Part C Coordinator. The results of the initial review indicated improvement in documentation. However, further additional technical assistance by the Part C Coordinator will be provided to the agency as 10 records were identified in FFY 2018 as needing additional documentation to determine if the delay was due to exceptional family circumstances. This will become part of the agency's FFY 2019 letter of determination.

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

The Part C Coordinator requested and received verification of the 10 records outlining the dates of the multidisciplinary evaluation, child and family assessment, and initial IFSP meeting.

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

### **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

### **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

### **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

### **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

## **7 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because of the discrepancy explained in the OSEP Response above, it was unclear if the State identified any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance. If the findings in question were in fact from FFY 2015, the State must provide an explanation in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR of why it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

### **Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

Documentation in the State's FFY 2017 annual performance reporting included an error by the Part C Coordinator. The 12 records found out of compliance in FFY 2016 were incorrectly identified as records found out of compliance in FFY 2015. In FFY 2016 the State identified 12 records as out of compliance with the regulatory requirements. Verification data was requested from the contractors with the following results:

2/12 records had no documentation describing the reasons for the delay. Verification data described that the initial IFSP meetings were completed on the 46th and 65th day respectively; however, documentation was insufficient to attribute the lateness due to exceptional family circumstances. Guidance was provided on the necessity of documenting reasons for lateness.

2/12 records documented delays in completing the family assessment. Verification data described that the family assessments were completed on the 47th and 60th day respectively. Guidance was provided that, in addition to the child assessment, the family assessment is also required to be completed within the 45-day timeline.

\*1/12 records provided documentation that the service coordinator did not receive the child's intake file until 4 days prior to the 45th day. Verification data described the completion of the multidisciplinary evaluation, child and family assessment and initial IFSP meeting on the 57th day.

\*1/12 records provided documentation that the service coordinator did not receive the child's intake file until after the 45th day. Verification data described the completion of the multidisciplinary evaluation, child and family assessment and initial IFSP meeting on the 63rd day.

\*2/12 records provided documentation that turnover of the assigned service coordinators led to completion of the multidisciplinary evaluations, child and family assessments and initial IFSP meetings on the 57th and 76th days respectively.

\*2/12 records provided documentation that slow intake\*\* completions and multidisciplinary evaluations led to completion on 46th and 60th day respectively.

\*1/12 records provided documentation that the intake\*\* personnel did not enter the child into the State's database thus leading to the completion of the multidisciplinary evaluation, child and family assessment, and initial IFSP meeting on the 69th day.

\*1/12 records provided documentation that the service coordinator did not receive the child's file until after the 45th day thus leading to completion of the multidisciplinary evaluation, child and family assessment and initial IFSP meeting on the 77th day.

\*Due to reasons outlined above by an asterisk, the Part C Coordinator provided training with accompanying handouts to all contractors' service coordinators outlining the regulatory requirements for the 45-day timeline on April 3, 2017 and provided the State's Data Management System Guidance for Montana's Individual Family Service Plan and Child Outcomes Summary Process in April 2017. The training slides were provided to the contractors to be included in their annual training plans.

\*\*Intake: this position at each regional agency is the first person a family member or referral source engages with. Intake workers are responsible for collecting demographic information about the child and family, entering the data into the State's database, assigning a service coordinator, and distributing any collected information about the child and family to the assigned service coordinator so that he or she may set appointments for the multidisciplinary evaluation, child and family assessment, and initial IFSP meeting.

## **7 - OSEP Response**

## **7 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

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

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C})] \times 100$ .
- B. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B})] \times 100$ .
- C. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B})] \times 100$ .

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8A - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	100.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	97.50%	97.41%	98.47%	100.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

If no, please explain.

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
298	303	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

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

This number will be added to the "Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

5

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

State database

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

XXX

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

Data was collected from the full reporting period, July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.

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

Data analysis for this Indicator began in May 2018 with a group of stakeholders made up of representatives from each regional contractor. The work group identified specific materials to increase the reliability and validity of the Indicator 8 data and overall improve the transition process for children and families:

Training on documenting exits for Part C of the IDEA and supporting guidance "Exit Decision Tree" (August 16, 2018) and Training on Montana's transition process and procedure (August 16, 2018).

Additional changes were made to the State's database to reflect the procedural changes: transition conference invitations for Part C to B and for other transition conferences, transition timelines and flowchart embedded into the system as business rules; and revision of the transition plan as part of the IFSP.

All contractors and the Part C Coordinator engaged in ongoing monitoring of the process and procedure using the State's system reporting features: 1) Part C Exit Report, 2) Part C Notification of Potentially Eligible Children Report, 3) Part C to B Transition Conferences Report, and 4) Part B Service Referrals Report.

The result of the work group's analysis and solutions is a more clearly defined process with the accompanying tools to complete the transitions as well as documentation of the transition components meeting regulatory requirements and meet the compliance target of 100% for Indicator 8a.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

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

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Each contractor was required, per their letters of determination, to verify that all Indicators 8a, 8b, and 8c were in full compliance based upon updated data from the four reporting sources identified above. Each submitted the following

1. Verification of Service Coordinator training for both learning modules;
2. The agency's written process to review, monitor, and implement any correction plans to verify compliance.
3. The agencies will use ongoing transition plan data through frequent monitoring to ensure compliance.
4. Regional contractors contributing to the 4 records out of compliance were required to submit updated data to verify the regulatory requirements were being met.

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

Region "A" identified 4 records out of compliance with Indicator 8a. 2/3 records were due to time management issues by the service coordinator and 2/3 records were actually misidentified as out of compliance. Upon further review, the two children entered the Program less than 90 days before his/her third birthday. The supervisor provided support and ongoing guidance to the service coordinator regarding the regulatory requirements.

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**8A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because of the discrepancy explained in the OSEP Response above, it was unclear if the State identified any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance. If the finding in question was in fact from FFY 2015, the State must provide an explanation in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR of why it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

FFY 2016: The State identified 6/393 records as being non-compliant with Indicator 8a wherein transition steps and services were not identified. Upon further drill-down into the data and review of the contractor's records, the six children were enrolled in Montana's Family Education and Support (FES) Program rather than Part C of the IDEA. Each had exited the FES Program during the reporting period. The FES Program does not require transition steps and services until age 16. The error in documentation was one reason why the State brought together the stakeholder work group to ensure a consistent understanding of the regulatory requirements for Part C and the methods to correctly document within the State's database as well as ensure the database business rules are correctly identifying the Indicator's target population.

**8A - OSEP Response**



## 8A - Required Actions

## Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

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

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8B - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	100.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	96.43%	100.00%	100.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

YES

If no, please explain.

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
290	303	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of parents who opted out

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

13

Describe the method used to collect these data

Data was collected using the State's database system from the following reporting tools:

1. Part C Exit Report
2. Part C Notification of Potentially Eligible Children Report
3. Part C to B Transition Conferences Report
4. Part B Service Referrals Report.

Additionally, each contractor performed analysis of a statistically-valid, randomized sample size documenting the notification date, if the LEA and SEA was notified at least 90 days and if not, why. Additionally, the source of data was identified.

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

YES

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

YES

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

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 for the full reporting period, July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.

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

Data analysis for this Indicator began in May 2018 with a group of stakeholders made up of representatives from each contractor. The work group identified specific materials to increase the reliability and validity of the Indicator 8 data and overall improve the transition process for children and families:

Training on documenting exits for Part C of the IDEA and supporting guidance "Exit Decision Tree" (August 16, 2018) and Training on Montana's transition process and procedure (August 16, 2018).

Additional changes were made to the State's database to reflect the procedural changes: transition conference invitations for Part C to B and for other transition conferences, transition timelines and flowchart embedded into the system as business rules; and revision of the transition plan as part of the IFSP.

All contractors and the Part C Coordinator engaged in ongoing monitoring of the process and procedure using the State's system reporting features: 1) Part C Exit Report, 2) Part C Notification of Potentially Eligible Children Report, 3) Part C to B Transition Conferences Report, and 4) Part B Service Referrals Report.

The result of the work group's analysis and solutions is a more clearly defined process with the accompanying tools to complete the transitions as well as documentation of the transition components meeting regulatory requirements and meet the compliance target of 100% for Indicator 8b.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

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 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

**8B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because of the discrepancy explained in the OSEP Response above, it was unclear if the State identified any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, despite the State reporting that its data was 100%. If the findings in question were in fact from FFY 2016, the State must provide an explanation in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR of why it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

FFY 2016: No findings of noncompliance for Indicator 8b were identified.

FFY 2015: 2/130 files reviewed did not identify any reasons why the LEA/SEA were not notified at least 90 days prior to the child's third birthday. Upon further analysis performed in FFY 2016 as part of the stakeholder work group, an error in the State's database was identified and rectified by the database developer that may have caused the omission of the LEA/SEA notification. No additional documentation from the two files could be found to verify the database system error was the culprit for the two missing notifications. Training was provided to all contractors on how to generate notifications to the SEA and LEA using the functionality of the State's database rather than providing an agency generated document. This functionality was expected to be used consistently across all regions in FFY 2016.

**8B - OSEP Response**

**8B - Required Actions**

## Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

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

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C})] \times 100$ .
- B. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B})] \times 100$ .
- C. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B})] \times 100$ .

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8C - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	100.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

If no, please explain.

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
212	303	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

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

0

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

91

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

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 for the full reporting period, July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.

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

Data analysis for this Indicator began in May 2018 with a group of stakeholders made up of representatives from each contractor. The work group identified specific materials to increase the reliability and validity of the Indicator 8 data and overall improve the transition process for children and families:

Training on documenting exits for Part C of the IDEA and supporting guidance "Exit Decision Tree" (August 16, 2018) and

Training on Montana's transition process and procedure (August 16, 2018).

Additional changes were made to the State's database to reflect the procedural changes: transition conference invitations for Part C to B and for other transition conferences, transition timelines and flowchart embedded into the system as business rules; and revision of the transition plan as part of the IFSP.

All contractors and the Part C Coordinator engaged in ongoing monitoring of the process and procedure using the State's system reporting features: 1) Part C Exit Report, 2) Part C Notification of Potentially Eligible Children Report, 3) Part C to B Transition Conferences Report, and 4) Part B Service Referrals Report.

The result of the work group's analysis and solutions is a more clearly defined process with the accompanying tools to complete the transitions as well as documentation of the transition components meeting regulatory requirements and meet the compliance target of 100% for Indicator 8c.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

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 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**8C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

**8C - OSEP Response**

**8C - Required Actions**



## Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 9 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

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

NA

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

This indicator is not applicable to Montana Milestones Part C Early Intervention Program as the Part B process procedures have not been adopted.

**Select yes to use target ranges.**

NA

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

NA

**Provide an explanation below.**

NA

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	NA
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	NA

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

NA

### Historical Data

Baseline	NA	NA			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target>=	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Data	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=	NA	NA

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

**Targets**

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	NA	NA	NA	NA

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

NA

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

NA

**9 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

**9 - OSEP Response**

**9 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 10: Mediation

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent =  $((2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) \text{ divided by } 2.1) \text{ times } 100$ .

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 10 - Indicator Data

#### Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

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

NO

#### Provide an explanation below

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Montana is not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediation requests is less than 10.

#### Historical Data

Baseline	2005				
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target>=					
Data					

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=		

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
		0				N/A	N/A

#### Targets

<b>FFY</b>	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

<b>2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints</b>	<b>2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints</b>	<b>2.1 Number of mediations held</b>	<b>FFY 2017 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Target (low)</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Target (high)</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

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

**10 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

**10 - OSEP Response**

**10 - Required Actions**

## **Certification**

### **Instructions**

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

#### **Certify**

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

Select the certifier's role

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

**Name:**

**Title:**

**Email:**

**Phone:**

**Submitted on:**