

OR
Part C

FFY2016
State Performance Plan /
Annual Performance Report

Executive Summary:

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) Office of Student Services is responsible for Oregon's 197 school districts and 35 Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) programs that serve students eligible for IDEA services. ODE works collaboratively with districts and programs to support improved academic and functional results for children with disabilities. ODE supports and monitors its districts and programs via the following processes: General Supervision System; Technical Assistance System; Professional Development System; Stakeholder Involvement; and Reporting to the Public. These systems are designed to facilitate high expectations and college and career readiness (CCR) for Oregon's students with disabilities.

Oregon has a Technical Assistance System that utilizes technology and personnel to provide districts and programs timely access to data and activities that ensure compliance, as well as improved academic and functional outcomes for students with disabilities. Education specialists serve as a single point of contact for districts and programs. In addition, a web-based system provides access to data and on-demand technical assistance, to specialists, districts, and programs.

Oregon's Professional Development System leverages both IDEA discretionary funds and funds from the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) to provide every district and program the opportunity to receive direct technical assistance and professional development focusing on the implementation of evidence-based practices for students with disabilities. Activities include: annual state-wide training on data collections and compliance and performance issues as informed by the state-wide, web-based System Performance Review & Improvement (SPR&I) application; workshops to parents of students with disabilities regarding procedural safeguards and navigating the IEP or IFSP; and support for programs to implement Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS). In addition, districts/programs can request individualized technical assistance from ODE and every effort is made to provide the professional development on-site.

Oregon solicits stakeholder input as needed on Annual Performance Report (APR) target setting and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) content. Oregon creates Special Education Report Cards for each of Oregon's 197 school districts and 35 Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) county programs. These report cards display the indicators on the Annual Performance Report that is required for public reporting. Report cards are given to parents of children with disabilities and made available to the public on ODE's website.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part C requirements are met, e.g., monitoring systems, dispute resolution systems.

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) works collaboratively with nine contractors and 35 Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) county programs on comprehensive data collection, analysis, performance reporting, improvement planning, implementation, and progress reporting.

ODE's general supervision system is coordinated out of the Office of Student Services and includes data, monitoring, and legal components that are designed to identify noncompliance. Components are organized as follows:

System Performance Review & Improvement (SPR&I): All EI/ECSE programs in Oregon receiving IDEA funds are required to participate in the ODE SPR&I system of annual accountability and performance reporting. This system focuses on procedural compliance and performance indicators identified through federal and state regulation and previous state monitoring findings. Programs conduct individual child file reviews annually to collect procedural compliance data. These data are collected on a specified number of child files determined by ODE and are evenly split between Early Intervention, Early Intervention Transition, and Early Childhood Special Education. Individual child procedural compliance data is collected by programs and submitted to ODE electronically through the SPR&I database. The SPR&I system provides ODE the mechanism for review of district/program policies, procedures, and systems, to ensure the requirements set forth in 43 CFR 300.600-609 and CFR 303.501 are met.

Complaints and dispute resolution: While ODE oversees complaints, due process hearings, mediations, and other alternative dispute resolution activities as part of its general supervision responsibilities, only complaints and due process hearings result in findings of noncompliance.

ODE uses independent contractors to conduct mediations and complaint investigations for ODE, with support, coordination, and additional assistance by the ODE special education legal specialist. ODE provides training and oversight for these complaint contractors. When a complaint final order identifies noncompliance and orders corrective action, ODE staff work with program staff to

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

ensure completion of corrective action within required time lines. ODE uses the same complaint resolution system and complaint contractors for Part B and Part C.

ODE has a one-tier due process hearing system. All special education due process hearings are conducted by Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) administrative law judges. OAH and ODE have trained OAH administrative law judges to conduct special education hearings. When a due process hearing final order identifies noncompliance and orders corrective action, ODE staff work with program staff to ensure completion of corrective action within required time lines. ODE uses the same due process hearing system and complaint contractors for Part B and Part C.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

Technical Assistance System:

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

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) provides Technical Assistance (TA) to Oregon's 35 Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) county programs in several ways. ODE makes use of a state-wide, web-based cycle of continuous improvement mechanism called System Performance Review & Improvement (SPR&I). This system allows both programs and county contacts access to data and activities so that monitoring compliance/noncompliance can occur with regularity and accuracy and allowing for timely corrective action to occur. In addition, ODE provides annual training that addresses data collection, and compliance and performance issues, as part of the SPR&I continuous improvement mechanism.

The ODE website (<http://www.oregon.gov/ode/students-and-family/SpecialEducation/earlyintervention/Pages/default.aspx>) provides up-to-date forms, statutes and regulations, policies and procedures, and program operation guidelines.

ODE uses e-mail distribution lists to provide timely information and support to programs ensuring that critical information is received.

ODE and the nine EI/ECSE contractors who provide the direct services to Oregon's birth to 5 population provide regular supervision, training, and technical assistance to subcontractors with regards to compliance and other issues through bi-monthly meetings.

Other TA provided as needed may include: advice by experts; assistance in identifying and implementing professional development, instructional strategies, or methods of instruction that are based on scientifically based instruction; using experienced program coordinators and EI/ECSE Specialists to provide advice, technical assistance, and support; and collaboration with institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, national centers of technical assistance, and private TA providers.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) has several systems in place to provide professional development to its 35 Early Intervention and Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) county programs throughout the state. ODE supports the implementation of Collaborative Problem Solving (CPS), Early Childhood Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (ECPBIS), and the Center on the Social and Emotional Foundation for Early Learning (CSEFEL) model for promoting social and emotional competence in young children receiving EI/ECSE services. ODE staff participate in state wide networks such as the Social Emotional Work Group and the Northwest Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support.

The State Interagency Coordination Council brings together several agencies that serve infants, toddlers and preschoolers and provides a channel for information to be shared among programs and stakeholders that include the Early Learning Division, Early Head Start, Head Start, Preschool Promise, EI/ECSE providers, Migrant Head Start, Title V Program, Tribal Head Start, Early Childhood Mental Health (DHS), and the Homeless Liaison, among others. ODE provides annual, state-wide training, on compliance and performance issues as informed by the state-wide, web-based, cycle of continuous improvement mechanism called Systems Performance Review & Improvement. Additionally, ODE provides an annual week long Summer Institute on topics generated by ODE and EI/ECSE providers, and our Summer Institute partners: the Oregon Health Authority and the Early Learning Division. The Confederation of Oregon School Administrators also has an EI/ECSE strand in their annual fall conference. In addition, ODE contracts with the Family and Community Together (FACT) to provide six workshops per year to families in both English and Spanish. Topics include procedural safeguards, navigating the IFSP process and kindergarten transition.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part C results indicators

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

On November 7, 2013, 63 stakeholders participated in Annual Performance Report (APR) target setting and dialogue on State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) content. Among those invited were parents, representatives of school districts, EI/ECSE service providers, education service districts, higher education, charter schools, private schools, and state agencies. Members of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) and the State Advisory Council for Special Education (SACSE) also participated. Following a review of past APR data, input was sought for targets for the 2013-2018 SPP/APR. Stakeholders were also presented with information on the development of the B17 and C11 SSIP and the determination of the State- Initiated Measurable Results. This process was repeated in seven regional trainings for all EI/ECSE programs in the state.

On November 7, 2014, stakeholders participated in a dialogue regarding the APP/APR and Phase I of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) content.

On November 4, 2015, 12 stakeholders participated in Annual Performance Report (APR) target setting and dialogue focused specifically on the Parent Survey.

On November 6, 2015, 52 stakeholders participated in Annual Performance Report (APR) target setting and dialogue on State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) content. Among those invited were parents, representatives of school districts, EI/ECSE service providers, education service districts, higher education, charter schools, private schools, and state agencies. Members of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) and the State Advisory Council for Special Education (SACSE) also participated. Following a review of past Parent Survey data, input was sought for targets for the 2014-2018 SPP/APR. Stakeholders were also presented with a review of Phase I of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) and an opportunity for stakeholders to provide feedback on Phase II of the SSIP.

On November 29, 2016, over 55 stakeholders participated in Annual Performance Report (APR) target setting and dialogue on State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) content. Among those invited were parents, representatives of school districts, EI/ECSE service providers, education service districts, higher education, charter schools, private schools, and state agencies. Members of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) and the State Advisory Council for Special Education (SACSE) also participated. Stakeholders were presented with a review of Phase II of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) and an opportunity for stakeholders to provide feedback targets for Indicators C3, B7 and C11.

On November 29, 2017, over 50 stakeholders participated in review of and submitted recommendations for Oregon's standards under the new federal regulations concerning Significant Disproportionality. Among those invited were parents and representatives of: school districts, EI/ECSE service providers, education service districts, higher education, charter schools/virtual schools, private schools, and state agencies, including ODE. Members of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) and the State Advisory Council for Special Education (SACSE) were in attendance. The agenda also included a review of Phase II and Phase III of both the Part B and Part C State Systemic Improvement Plans (SSIP), with a focus on scale-up efforts and evaluation of progress.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2015 performance of each EIS Program or Provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2015 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2015 APR in 2017, is available.

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) produces Special Education Report Cards annually. These report cards display the indicators required for public reporting and the corresponding data for each of Oregon's 35 Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education county programs. Additional report cards are produced for the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs and a combined report card for Sherman, Gilliam, and Wheeler counties. These Special Education Report cards are then released to the public 60 days following the Annual Performance Report (APR) submission to OSEP (Office of Special Education Programs). Report cards were made available to the public on April 5, 2017. ODE requires that districts distribute the cards to all parents of students with Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSP). ODE then makes all 35 Special Education Report cards available to the public via its website in both Spanish and English at:

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

- <http://www.oregon.gov/ode/students-and-family/SpecialEducation/earlyintervention/Pages/default.aspx>.

In addition, a public announcement is sent via the statewide message system of the Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction to major Oregon news media. ODE provides the current APR at the following address:

- <http://www.oregon.gov/ode/reports-and-data/SpEdReports/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-and-Annual-Performance-Report-for-Special-Education.aspx>.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

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

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Family Service Plans (IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		99.00%	100%	95.10%	95.70%	96.60%	96.50%	95.30%	94.70%	96.00%	90.91%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	85.62%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
		85.62%	100%	

<p>Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i></p>	0
--	---

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).

During 2005-2006, ODE defined "timely manner" (based on guidance from OSEP) as the initiation date on the IFSP or ten days from when the parent provides consent for the IFSP service.

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

- State monitoring
- State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

System Performance Review and Improvement (SPR&I): All Early Intervention programs in Oregon receiving IDEA funds are required to participate in the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) SPR&I system of annual accountability and performance reporting. This system focuses on procedural compliance and indicators identified through federal and state regulation and previous state monitoring findings. Programs conduct individual child file reviews annually to collect procedural compliance data. These data are collected on a specified number of child files determined by ODE and are evenly split between Early Intervention, Early Intervention Transition, and Early Childhood Special Education. Individual child procedural compliance data is collected by programs and submitted to ODE electronically through the SPR&I database. ODE works collaboratively with programs on comprehensive data collection, analyses, performance reporting, improvement planning, implementation, and reporting of progress. The SPR&I system provides ODE the mechanism for review of district/program policies, procedures, and systems, to ensure the requirements set forth in 43 CFR 300.600-609 and CFR 303.501 are met.

Data are based on actual number of days.

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

The early intervention services indicated on an Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) are implemented by Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) programs as soon as possible following parent consent for services; if there is any delay, the reason must be documented.

As this is a compliance indicator, the target is 100%. In FFY 2016, Oregon was at 92.31% in providing early intervention services in a timely manner. This is a 6.69 percentage point increase from FFY 2015.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
22	22	0	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

ODE verified that 100% (22/22) of incidents of noncompliance in FFY 2015 were corrected within one year and that the programs with noncompliance demonstrate correction of practices that contributed to the noncompliance as well as current compliance with 34 CFR §§ 303.340(c), 303.342(e), 303.344(f)(1) through subsequent file reviews submitted in SPR&I.

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

ODE verified that 100% (22/22) of incidents of noncompliance in FFY 2015 were corrected within one year through data submission in SPR&I, the state online monitoring system. Six programs had one noncompliance each, two programs had two noncompliances each, two programs had three noncompliances each, and one program had six noncompliances. These eleven programs were required to verify through SPR&I that services were provided to these 22 children unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, provide an explanation for the delay in services, review the practices that contributed to the noncompliance, and demonstrate compliance through additional file reviews.

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

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			67.00%	70.00%	74.00%	78.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	96.50%
Data		81.00%	85.00%	90.40%	93.20%	95.00%	94.40%	95.90%	97.00%	96.46%	96.43%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	96.50%
Data	97.54%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	96.50%	96.50%	96.50%

Key:

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	3,762	
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	3,878	

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
3,762	3,878	97.54%	96.50%	97.01%

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2015	Target ≥						74.90%	80.90%	80.90%	81.40%	81.40%	81.40%
		Data					74.60%	80.90%	81.70%	83.60%	83.00%	82.72%	81.54%
A2	2015	Target ≥						53.50%	59.10%	59.10%	59.40%	59.40%	59.40%
		Data					53.50%	59.10%	58.40%	61.00%	58.00%	59.59%	57.29%
B1	2015	Target ≥						57.40%	63.70%	63.70%	64.20%	64.20%	64.20%
		Data					57.40%	63.70%	58.40%	58.80%	62.00%	61.24%	61.33%
B2	2015	Target ≥						12.20%	7.30%	7.30%	7.60%	7.60%	7.60%
		Data					12.20%	7.30%	10.70%	9.10%	9.70%	9.22%	8.51%
C1	2015	Target ≥						66.00%	64.40%	64.40%	64.90%	64.90%	64.90%
		Data					66.00%	64.40%	64.90%	64.60%	66.70%	65.97%	65.97%
C2	2015	Target ≥						21.90%	18.10%	18.10%	18.40%	18.40%	18.40%
		Data					21.90%	18.10%	16.40%	15.90%	15.40%	14.73%	13.29%

	FFY	2015
A1	Target ≥	82.00%
	Data	84.89%
A2	Target ≥	60.00%
	Data	41.00%
B1	Target ≥	64.30%
	Data	66.42%
B2	Target ≥	8.00%
	Data	35.69%
C1	Target ≥	65.00%
	Data	77.28%
C2	Target ≥	18.50%
	Data	40.33%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	85.40%	85.40%	85.40%
Target A2 ≥	42.30%	42.30%	42.30%
Target B1 ≥	66.70%	66.70%	66.70%
Target B2 ≥	36.00%	36.00%	36.00%
Target C1 ≥	77.80%	77.80%	77.80%
Target C2 ≥	40.60%	40.60%	40.60%

Key:

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

On November 7, 2013, 63 stakeholders participated in APR target setting and dialogue on State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)

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

content. Among those invited were parents, representatives of school districts, EI/ECSE service providers, education service districts, higher education, charter schools, private schools, and state agencies. Members of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) and the State Advisory Council for Special Education (SACSE) also participated. Following a review of past APR data, input was sought for targets for the 2013-2018 SPP/APR Stakeholders were also presented with information on the development of the B17 and C11 SSIP and the determination of the State-Initiated Measurable Results. This process was repeated in seven regional trainings for all EI/ECSE programs in the state.

Stakeholder input for these new baselines and targets was obtained through a variety of methods and settings. These new baselines and targets were reviewed, and input was received, at the annual System Performance Review and Improvement fall trainings, conducted with regional EI/ECSE staff on the following dates and locations:

- September 27, 2016, La Grande, Oregon
- September 29, 2016, Bend, Oregon
- October 13, 2016, Oregon City, Oregon
- October 18, 2016, Ashland, Oregon
- October 20, 2016, Eugene, Oregon
- October 25, 2016, Hillsboro, Oregon
- November 2, 2016, Salem, Oregon

These baselines and targets were reviewed by stakeholders on two additional occasions. The first was during the April 13, 2016 EI/ECSE contractors meeting. The second occasion was at the annual statewide special education stakeholders meeting conducted on Tuesday, November 29, 2016 at the Public Service Building, Salem, Oregon

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	2280.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	86.00	3.77%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	217.00	9.52%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1024.00	44.91%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	704.00	30.88%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	249.00	10.92%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	1728.00	2031.00	84.89%	85.40%	85.08%
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	953.00	2280.00	41.00%	42.30%	41.80%

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	41.00	1.80%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	653.00	28.64%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	792.00	34.74%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	459.00	20.13%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	335.00	14.69%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	1251.00	1945.00	66.42%	66.70%	64.32%

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

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	794.00	2280.00	35.69%	36.00%	34.82%

Reasons for B1 Slippage

During FFY 2016, three Assessment, Evaluation, Programming System (AEPS) trainings were conducted by authorized Brookes Publishing Company trainers. One of the trainings was conducted in the Portland, Oregon metropolitan area and included staff from the three largest Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) programs in the state. The other two trainings were conducted in rural areas of Oregon. This was the most comprehensive AEPS training since the initial AEPS trainings in FFY 2008. The staffs receiving the training serve 63.1% of the children in Oregon EI/ECSE programs. Increased staff accuracy in administering the AEPS due to the training may have resulted in the change in data from the previous year for C3 summary statements, including the 2.10 percentage point drop for summary statement B1.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	29.00	1.27%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	471.00	20.66%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	892.00	39.12%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	677.00	29.69%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	211.00	9.25%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	1569.00	2069.00	77.28%	77.80%	75.83%
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	888.00	2280.00	40.33%	40.60%	38.95%

Reasons for C1 Slippage

During FFY 2016, three Assessment, Evaluation, Programming System (AEPS) trainings were conducted by authorized Brookes Publishing Company trainers. One of the trainings was conducted in the Portland, Oregon metropolitan area and included staff from the three largest Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) programs in the state. The other two trainings were conducted in rural areas of Oregon. This was the most comprehensive AEPS training since the initial AEPS trainings in FFY 2008. The staffs receiving the training serve 63.1% of the children in Oregon EI/ECSE programs. Increased staff accuracy in administering the AEPS due to the training may have resulted in the change in data from the previous year for C3 summary statements, including the 1.45 percentage point drop for summary statement c1.

Reasons for C2 Slippage

During FFY 2016, three Assessment, Evaluation, Programming System (AEPS) trainings were conducted by authorized Brookes Publishing Company trainers. One of the trainings was conducted in the Portland, Oregon metropolitan area and included staff from the three largest Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) programs in the state. The other two trainings were conducted in rural areas of Oregon. This set of trainings was the most comprehensive (covering the largest number of children served) AEPS training conducted for EI/ECSE programs since the initial trainings during FFY 2008. For the FFY 2016 C3 child outcome data, 63.1% of the children were served by staff in the programs where this training took place. The drop in data may be due to the training that increased staff accuracy in administering the AEPS resulting in the 1.38 percentage point drop for summary statement C2.

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

The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's part C exiting 618 data	
The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.	

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

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? No

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

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

In 2015, using a national AEPS data set from typically developing children, a review team considered 90%, 85% and 80% percentile cut offs against the national data results to decide the cut off level that best reflected Oregon's children in EI programs. The review team, the Oregon Department of Education staff, the EI/ECSE Contractors and the EI/ECSE stakeholder group were all asked to analyze the percentile cut offs and determine the cut off level Oregon should use for reporting to the EI child outcomes. The consensus was to use the 80% cut off level. It was believed that this most closely represents the children who are eligible for Early Intervention programs and receive services in Oregon.

Child progress is measured using the following rubric:

- If a child enters with a score below the normal range and stays the same or regresses at the next test administration, the child is categorized as (a) does not improve functioning.
- If the child makes progress and the ratio of how far below the normal level of development increases between test administrations, the child is categorized as (b) improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.
- If the child makes progress but the ratio of how far below the normal level of development decreases between test administrations, the child is categorized as (c) improved functioning to a level nearer to the functioning of same-aged peers, but did not reach it.
- If a child enters with a score below the normal range and increases to reach or exceed the normal range at the next test administration, the child is categorized as (d) improved functioning sufficient to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.

If a child enters with a score at or above the normal range and maintains their score at or above the normal range at the next test administration, the child is categorized as (e) maintains functioning at or above same age peers.

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

As of 2008, all EI/ECSE programs in Oregon are required to enter individual child assessment results from the Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System (AEPS) into the Early Childhood Web (ecWeb). The aggregate results are utilized for reporting on indicators C3 and B7.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

In its FFY 2016 SPP/APR submission, the State must confirm that it reset its baseline by indicating the correct baseline year in the "Historical Data" section in GRADS.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 OSEP response

Oregon confirms that it reset the C3 baseline by indicating the correct baseline year in the "Historical Data" section in GRADS FFY 2016.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2014	Target ≥					76.00%	82.00%	86.00%	86.00%	86.00%	86.00%	89.63%
		Data			73.00%	56.00%	74.00%	71.00%	72.00%	85.00%	77.42%	65.12%	89.63%
B	2014	Target ≥					72.00%	79.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	89.50%
		Data			71.00%	52.00%	67.00%	66.00%	72.00%	81.00%	72.04%	58.14%	89.50%
C	2014	Target ≥					79.00%	85.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	92.09%
		Data			81.00%	68.00%	79.00%	76.00%	72.00%	95.00%	83.87%	76.74%	92.09%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	89.73%
	Data	91.42%
B	Target ≥	89.60%
	Data	89.67%
C	Target ≥	92.19%
	Data	92.72%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	89.83%	90.00%	91.00%
Target B ≥	89.70%	90.00%	91.00%
Target C ≥	92.29%	92.59%	93.09%

Key:

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of families to whom surveys were distributed	1472.00
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	13.18% 194.00
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	184.77
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	194.00
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	180.15
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	194.00
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	183.52
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	194.00

	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their	91.42%	89.83%	95.24%

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

	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
rights			
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	89.67%	89.70%	92.86%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	92.72%	92.29%	94.60%

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

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

The sampling methodology was designed to chose a representative set of districts/programs each year that is reflective of the state population as a whole. Within districts/programs the population is stratified by school, grade, race/ethnicity, primary disability, and gender in order to ensure the representativeness of the sample. See the attached Sampling Plan for details.

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

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

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.

The representativeness of the Part C results was assessed by examining the demographic characteristics of the children of the parents who responded to the survey to the demographic characteristics of children with disabilities in the Part C population. This comparison indicates the results are generally representative by (1) age of the child and (2) primary disability of the child. For example, 57% of the population has a child who was age 2 as of December 1st, and the weighted results indicate that 54% of the respondents had a child who was age 2 as of December 1st. Parents of white children were over-represented (the weighted results indicate that 81% of parent respondents had a student with a race/ethnicity of white whereas 69% of children received Part C services are white). ODE will continue to encourage parents of children of all race/ethnicities to complete the survey. Results were weighted by program to ensure that the parent survey results reflected the population of parents.

ODE's sample plan whereby 1/2 of Part C programs are sampled in a given year is representative of the state as a whole. In assigning programs to the survey year, programs were stratified by special education enrollment, race/ethnicity demographics, and socioeconomic level. Programs were then randomly assigned to one of the two survey years. Second, for any given year, ODE then examines the demographic characteristics of the children of the parents who responded to the survey to the demographic characteristics of children with disabilities in the Part C programs to make sure that the parents who responded are representative of the entire population. Third, for the 2016-17 survey year, note that ODE stated that the results are generally representative by age of the child and disability of the child. ODE then stated the over-representation of parents of white students. ODE acknowledged a slight over-representation of white parents in responses collected. That said, when examining results on the items and survey scales, there were no statistically significant differences by race/ethnicity. ODE is confident in the representativeness of the results of the survey to the state. In terms of strategies for increasing the response rate of parents of non-white students, ODE is participating in the Family Outcomes Data Learning Community and the IDEA Data Center

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			0.60%	0.60%	0.70%	0.75%	0.62%	0.63%	0.64%	0.64%	0.76%
Data		0.75%	0.67%	0.61%	0.61%	0.61%	0.66%	0.76%	0.80%	0.82%	0.93%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	0.76%
Data	0.91%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	0.80%	0.80%	0.80%

Key:

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	450	null
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2016	6/22/2017	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	46,900	null
TBD			null	

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
450	46,900	0.91%	0.80%	0.96%

Compare your results to the national data

The FFY 2016 national data for C5 is 1.24% and the 2016 data for C5 for Oregon is 0.96%, which is 0.28 percentage points below the national average. The difference between Oregon C5 performance and National C5 performance could be attributed to two factors:

1. Oregon is not an "at risk" state and only serves children in Part C who are eligible for a disability.
2. Oregon is among the 20 states with the most restrictive eligibility requirements.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			1.67%	1.67%	1.83%	1.83%	2.00%	2.10%	2.20%	2.20%	2.20%
Data		1.78%	1.80%	1.78%	1.74%	1.84%	2.08%	2.14%	2.35%	2.42%	2.59%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	2.30%
Data	2.61%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	2.30%	2.40%	2.40%

Key:

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	3,878	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2016	6/22/2017	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	141,542	
TBD			null	

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
3,878	141,542	2.61%	2.30%	2.74%

Compare your results to the national data

The FFY 2016 national data for C6 is 3.12% and the 2016 data for C6 for Oregon is 2.74%, which is 0.38 percentage points below the national average. The difference between Oregon C5 performance and National C5 performance could be attributed to two factors:

1. Oregon is not an "at risk" state and only serves children in Part C who are eligible for a disability.
2. Oregon is among the 20 states with the most restrictive eligibility requirements

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		99.40%	99.30%	99.70%	99.50%	99.30%	99.80%	99.60%	99.70%	99.60%	99.72%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	99.56%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
3,451	3,945	99.56%	100%	99.26%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	465
---	-----

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

- State monitoring
- State database

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

7/2016-6/2017

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

The percentage was calculated using aggregated data collected monthly from all EI/ECSE programs in the state. Each monthly data report represents all children in the EI referral process from the second day of the previous month to the first day of the current month. Programs submit data completion status of EI evaluations, eligibility and initial IFSP meeting. Of those children, programs must document; (1) how many completed the process within 45 days of referral, (2) how many completed the process but not within 45 days of referral (these programs must submit a corrective action plan), (3) how many have not completed the process, and (4) how many discontinued the process and why.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings" table.
4/23/2018

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

of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
24	24	0	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

ODE verified that all programs with noncompliance correctly implemented 34 CFR §§303.310(a) and 303.342(a) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of subsequent monthly Corrective Action Plan (CAP) submissions.

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

ODE verified that 100% (24/24) of the incidents of noncompliance in FFY 2015 were corrected within one year. All programs with noncompliance conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, for any child for whom the 45-day timeline was not met based on a review of their CAPs from monthly reports, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		94.00%	100%	95.60%	96.20%	96.50%	99.30%	98.50%	100%	90.97%	94.41%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	96.58%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday.

- Yes
- No

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
137	144	96.58%	100%	95.14%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	0
--	---

Reasons for Slippage

In FFY 2016, 95.14% (137/144) of child files reviewed for EI transition included evidence of transition steps at least 90 calendar days, and, at the discretion of the parties, up to nine months before the child's third birthday. There were a total of seven incidents of noncompliance in six programs. This represents slippage of 1.44 percentage points from FFY 2015 (96.58%).

Slippage may be attributed to inadequate tracking of time tables for three children in three programs. Additionally, four programs did not include transition steps on the IFSP for four children. ODE has added a transition conference alert in ecWeb, the Oregon online IFSP database to provide all programs with timely reminders of transition conference due dates for each transition-age child.

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

- State monitoring
- State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

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

All EI programs in Oregon receiving IDEA funds are required to participate in the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) System Performance Review & Improvement (SPR&I) system of annual accountability and performance reporting. This system focuses on procedural compliance and performance indicators identified through federal and state regulation and previous state monitoring findings. Programs conduct individual child file reviews annually to collect procedural compliance data. These data are collected on a specified number of child files determined by ODE and are evenly split between Early Intervention, Early Intervention Transition, and Early Childhood Special Education. Individual child procedural compliance data is collected by programs and submitted to ODE electronically through the SPR&I database. ODE works collaboratively with programs on comprehensive data collection, analyses, performance reporting, improvement planning, implementation, and reporting of progress. The SPR&I system provides ODE the mechanism for review of district/program policies, procedures, and systems, to ensure the requirements set forth in 43 CFR §300.600-609 and CFR §303.501 are met.

As part of the standard operating procedures through SPR&I, EI/ECSE programs:

- Engage in self-assessment through data collection, review, and analysis to inform meaningful improvement.
- Report to ODE on timely transition planning for a predetermined number of child files selected for review.
- Address noncompliance with timely transition steps and services through corrective action documented in SPR&I that includes verifying that services were provided to children, an explanation for the cause of the noncompliance, correction of practices that contributed to the noncompliance, and demonstration of current compliance through subsequent data collection.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5	5	0	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2015, there were six incidents of noncompliance that resulted in five findings across five programs (one program had two incidents for a total of one finding, and four programs had one incident each for a total of four findings).

ODE verified through data submitted in SPR&I, the state online data system, that 100% (6/6) of incidents of noncompliance in FFY 2015 were corrected within one year and that the programs with noncompliance demonstrated correction of practices that contributed to the noncompliance as well as current compliance with 34 CFR §303.209 and 303.344(h) based on a review of new files submitted in SPR&I.

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

In FFY 2015, 96.58% (141/146) of child files reviewed for EI transition included transition steps at least 90 calendar days, and, at the discretion of the parties, up to nine months before the child's third birthday to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services. There were six incidents of noncompliance that resulted in five findings across five programs (one program had two incidents for a total of one finding, and four programs had one incident each for a total of four findings).

ODE verified through data submitted in SPR&I, the state online data system, that 100% (6/6) of incidents of noncompliance in FFY 2015 were corrected within one year and that the programs with noncompliance developed an IFSP with transition steps and services for each child, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EI program. Additionally, programs were required to provide through SPR&I the cause of the noncompliance, and demonstrate correction of practices that contributed to the noncompliance through subsequent data submission to SPR&I.

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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

- Yes
- No

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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
144	144	100%	100%	100%

<p>Number of parents who opted out This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.</p>	0
---	---

Describe the method used to collect these data

All EI programs in Oregon receiving IDEA funds are required to participate in the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) Systems Performance Review & Improvement (SPR&I) system of annual accountability and performance reporting. This system focuses on procedural compliance and performance indicators identified through federal and state regulation and previous state monitoring findings. Programs conduct individual child file reviews annually to collect procedural compliance data. These data are collected on a specified number of child files determined by ODE and are evenly split between Early Intervention, Early Intervention Transition, and Early Childhood Special Education. Individual child procedural compliance data is collected by programs and submitted to ODE electronically through the SPR&I database. ODE works collaboratively with programs on comprehensive data collection, analyses, performance reporting, improvement planning, implementation, and reporting of progress. The SPR&I system provides ODE the mechanism for

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

review of district/program policies, procedures, and systems, to ensure the requirements set forth in 43 CFR §300.600-609 and CFR §303.501 are met.

ODE is notified monthly via ecWeb, the state online IFSP data base, of all children transitioning from early intervention to early childhood special education. On the first day of every month, in ecWeb, an SEA/LEA Transition Notification report is generated and distributed to the SEA/LEA. These data comprise a list of all of the EI children in Oregon who are currently in process of transitioning to ECSE services.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? No

Is the policy on file with the Department? No

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

- State monitoring
- State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

All EI programs in Oregon receiving IDEA funds are required to participate in the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) Systems Performance Review & Improvement (SPR&I) system of annual accountability and performance reporting. This system focuses on procedural compliance and performance indicators identified through federal and state regulation and previous state monitoring findings. Programs conduct individual child file reviews annually to collect procedural compliance data. These data are collected on a specified number of child files determined by ODE and are evenly split between Early Intervention, Early Intervention Transition, and Early Childhood Special Education. Individual child procedural compliance data is collected by programs and submitted to ODE electronically through the SPR&I database. ODE works collaboratively with programs on comprehensive data collection, analyses, performance reporting, improvement planning, implementation, and reporting of progress. The SPR&I system provides ODE the mechanism for review of district/program policies, procedures, and systems, to ensure the requirements set forth in 43 CFR §300.600-609 and CFR §303.501 are met.

ODE is notified monthly via ecWeb, the state online IFSP data base, of all children transitioning from early intervention to early childhood special education. On the first day of every month, in ecWeb, an SEA/LEA Transition Notification report is generated and distributed to the SEA/LEA. These data comprise a list of all of the EI children in Oregon who are currently in process of transitioning to ECSE services.

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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

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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		87.00%	100%	96.30%	94.70%	90.80%	94.00%	94.90%	95.10%	88.89%	97.20%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	95.21%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services

- Yes
- No

Please explain

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
140	144	95.21%	100%	97.22%

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference <i>This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.</i>	0
Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	0

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

- State monitoring
- State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

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

All EI programs in Oregon receiving IDEA funds are required to participate in the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) System Performance Review & Improvement (SPR&I) system of annual accountability and performance reporting. This system focuses on procedural compliance and performance indicators identified through federal and state regulation and previous state monitoring findings. Programs conduct individual child file reviews annually to collect procedural compliance data. These data are collected on a specified number of child files determined by ODE and are evenly split between Early Intervention, Early Intervention Transition, and Early Childhood Special Education. Individual child procedural compliance data is collected by programs and submitted to ODE electronically through the SPR&I database. ODE works collaboratively with programs on comprehensive data collection, analyses, performance reporting, improvement planning, implementation, and reporting of progress. The SPR&I system provides ODE the mechanism for review of district/program policies, procedures, and systems, to ensure the requirements set forth in 43 CFR §300.600-609 and CFR §303.501 are met.

As part of the standard operating procedures through SPR&I, EI/ECSE programs:

- Engage in self-assessment through data collection, review, and analysis to inform meaningful improvement.
- Report to ODE on timely transition planning for a predetermined number of child files selected for review.
- Address noncompliance with timely transition steps and services through corrective action documented in SPR&I that includes verifying that services were provided to children, an explanation for the cause of the noncompliance, correction of practices that contributed to the noncompliance, and demonstration of current compliance through subsequent data collection.

As this is a compliance indicator, the target is 100%. In FFY 2016, Oregon was at 95.21% in providing timely transition conferences. This is a 2.01 percentage point increase from FFY 2015.

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	6	0	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2015, 95.21% (139/146) of child files reviewed for EI transition included evidence of a transition planning conference at least 90 calendar days, and, at the discretion of the parties, up to nine months before the child's third birthday. There were seven incidents of noncompliance that resulted in six findings across six programs (one program had two incidents for a total of one finding and five programs had one incident each for a total of five findings).

ODE verified that 100% (7/7) incidents of noncompliance in FFY 2014 were corrected within one year and that the programs with noncompliance demonstrated correction of practices that contributed to the noncompliance as well as current compliance with 34 CFR §303.209 based on a review of new files submitted in SPR&I.

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

There were seven individual incidents of noncompliance that resulted in six findings across six programs. ODE verified through data submission to SPR&I that 100% (7/7) of incidents of noncompliance in FFY 2015 were corrected within one year and that the programs with noncompliance conducted a transition conference for any child potentially eligible for Part B whose transition conference was not timely, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EI program. Additionally, programs were required to provide through SPR&I the cause of the noncompliance, and demonstrate correction of practices that contributed to the noncompliance through subsequent data submission to SPR&I

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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures under section 615 of the IDEA are adopted).

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data:

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

FFY	2015
Target ≥	
Data	

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥			

Key:

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	n	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0			0%

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

FFY	2015
Target ≥	
Data	100%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥			

Key:

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

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

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	0	100%		

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Reported Data

Baseline Data:

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016
Target				
Data				

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target		

Key:

Description of Measure

Description of Measure

The State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) for infants, toddlers, and preschool children with disabilities and their families is to increase the rate of growth in social-emotional and approaches to learning skills for children with disabilities, birth through age five. The SIMR will be measured by using the child outcome data for both C3 and B7, Outcomes A and B, Summary statement 1.

Note: Baseline data and targets are included as an attachment.

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Overview

Data Analysis

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

Introduction

ODE began the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) data analysis process by reviewing data reported through its State Performance Plan/Annual Progress Report (SPP/APR). ODE staff members were assigned specific APR indicators to analyze and disaggregate by race, ethnicity, gender and geographic region. The analyses of these data were shared with staff through a series of seven SSIP team meetings focused on interpreting the data, generating additional analysis strategies, and producing suggestions of other data sources for root cause analysis. Through this process, the SSIP team began narrowing its area of focus to specific child and student outcomes to target for the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR).

Data Analysis

1a. Analysis of key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other data as applicable to determine the SIMR and the root causes contributing to low performance.

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) manages many statewide data collections designed to meet federal and state reporting requirements, inform statewide policy development, and guide practice. All data collections have an ODE staff member designated as

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

the primary owner who provides specific documentation, instruction, and training for the particular data collection.

ODE's data systems support electronic data collection from the programs and school districts. All data submitted through the electronic systems are reviewed upon submission for errors to ensure valid and accurate data are collected. The data systems include a unique identifier for each child and staff member for whom data are reported in each data collection. These identifiers allow for comparison and reliability checks across data collections. As part of most data collections, reports are provided to programs and school districts to review and verify the data submitted are accurate. ODE analyzes the collected data to ensure data are valid, reliable, and are reported in a timely and accurate manner.

In addition, ODE utilizes the System Performance Review and Improvement (SPR&I) database to collect and disseminate data related to general supervision. Through SPR&I, ODE monitors local program implementation of Early Intervention and Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) service delivery practices and procedures. All EI/ECSE programs are monitored annually and the SPR&I database reports provide comparisons to statewide data and program data. EI/ECSE programs have access to these data for use in self-assessment, review, and documentation of evidence of change via program improvement plans. EI/ECSE programs review current practices in relation to compliance standards and performance profile data. Data analysis and interpretation are used to inform local improvement planning decisions and activities, and to correct any identified noncompliance.

The collected data were analyzed to inform development and selection of the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). The following data sources were identified as part of the broad data analysis:

- SPP/APR data for Early Intervention and Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) indicators
- Special Education Child Count (SECC)
- EI/ECSE Leaver Data
- EI/ECSE Assessment Data Collection – Child Outcome Data
- Child Find Data Collection
- Referral Data Collection

The following is the review process used as part of the broad data analysis:

- Performance on each SPP/APR indicator was reviewed and summarized for the current five year period.
- Compliance and performance indicator data were disaggregated to drill down to identify potential focus areas for the SIMR.
- Data analysis was reviewed internally with EI/ECSE and School Age teams in the spring of 2014 and as a result, additional analysis was conducted to narrow down the potential focus areas of the SIMR.
- Data analysis was presented to both internal and external stakeholders throughout the year for review and feedback.

Other Data:

- National Outcome Data for Children Served Through IDEA's Early Childhood Programs (from The Early Childhood Outcomes Center)
- Oregon Kindergarten Assessment: An assessment that measures skills in literacy, math, and approaches to learning as children enter kindergarten.
- Oregon Third Grade Reading Performance Results (B3) Benchmarks

1b. Data Disaggregation.

Compliance and performance SPP/APR indicator data were disaggregated to drill down to identify potential focus areas for the SIMR. During the broad and focused data analysis, data were disaggregated by geographic area, disability, race/ethnicity, age group, and gender as illustrated in the following table.

APR Indicator Data Disaggregation

	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5/C6	C7	C8	B6	B7	B8	B11	B12
Geographic Area	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Disability			x		x	x		x	x		x	x
Race/Ethnicity	x	x				x	x	x	x			
Age Group			x		x	x		x	x			
Gender		x	x					x	x			

Definitions

C1: Timely Services (EI) C7: Timely evaluation (EI) B8: Parent involvement (ECSE)

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

C2: Services in typical settings (EI) C8: Timely transition from EI to ECSE B11: Timely evaluation (ECSE)

C3: Improved outcomes (EI) B6: Services in typical settings (ECSE)

C4: Family participation (EI) B7: Improved outcomes (ECSE) B12: Timely transition from EI to ECSE

C5 and C6: Child find (EI) (ECSE)

During the broad analysis, ODE examined disaggregated data of the following performance indicators:

- C2 – Services in Typical Settings (EI)
- B6 – Services in Typical Settings (ECSE)
- C3 – Improved Outcomes (EI)
- B7 – Improved Outcomes (ECSE)

Services in Typical Settings

The following tables show the percentages of children with IFSPs who received services in typical settings. The data for both EI and ECSE were disaggregated by disability, race/ethnicity, and geographic area (county and one Tribal Reservation) of the state.

C2: Early Intervention Settings

FFY 2013	State Target	State Performance
EI services in home or community settings	80%	96.5%

Data Source: Oregon Annual Performance Report

C2: Early Intervention Services by Disability

FFY 2013	Number All Settings	Number Typical Setting	% in Typical Setting
Autism	44	41	93.2%
Developmental Delay	2994	2888	96.5%
Hearing Impaired	150	147	98.0%
Orthopedically Impaired	43	40	93.0%
Vision Impaired	70	68	97.1%

Data Source: Oregon Department of Education Office of Special Education Census Data Multi-Year Data Base (Spring 2014 release).

Note: There were too few children to report in the category of Deaf Blind.

C2: Early Intervention by Race/Ethnicity

FFY 2013	Number All Settings	Number Typical Setting	% in Typical Setting
Asian	95	93	97.9%
Black	74	71	96.0%
Hispanic	726	706	97.2%
Native American	41	35	85.4%
White	2231	2150	96.4%
Multi-racial	113	109	96.4%

Data Source: FFY 2013 Table 2 Part C, Section A: Age Group and Setting of Infants and Toddlers, Ages Birth through 2.

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
C2: Early Intervention by Highest/Lowest Percent of Children in Typical Settings by
Geographic Areas (County and one Tribal Reservation) of the State**

FFY 2013	# in All Settings	# in Typical Settings	% in Typical Settings
Highest			
Lincoln	55	55	100%
Polk	50	50	100%
Yamhill	20	20	100%
Lowest			
Warm Springs	15	9	60.0%
Josephine	43	33	76.7%
Hood River	18	14	77.8%

Data Source: Oregon Department of Education System Performance Review and Improvement database.

B6: Early Childhood Special Education Settings

Federal Placement Distribution Measurement FFY 2013	State Target	State Performance
Majority ECSE services in Early Childhood Program	35% or higher	40.0%
Separate ECSE class, school or residential facility	24.6% or lower	24.3%

Data Source: FFY 2013 Table 3 Part B, Section A: Discrete Age of Children with Disabilities Ages 3-5 by Educational Environment.

B6: Early Childhood Special Education Services by Disability

FFY 2013	# in All Settings	# in Typical Settings	# in Separate special education class, school, or residential facility	% in Typical Setting	% in Separate Setting
Autism	1042	363	388	34.8%	37.2%
Developmental Delay	2200	909	861	41.3%	39.1%
Hearing Impaired	188	66	52	35.1%	27.7%
Other Health Impaired	329	151	59	45.9%	39.1%
Orthopedically Impaired	188	68	66	36.2%	35.1%
Speech/Language	5980	2419	1007	40.4%	16.8%
Vision Impaired	79	31	23	39.2%	29.1%
Emotional Disturbance	44	23	*	52.3%	*
Intellectual Disability	55	16	36	29.0%	65.4%

Data Source: FFY 2013 Table 3 Part B, Section B: Educational Environment of Children with Disabilities Ages 3-5 by Disability. Note: There were too few children to report in the categories of Deaf Blind, Traumatic Brain Injury, and Emotional Disturbance (separate setting).

B6: Early Childhood Special Education Settings by Race/Ethnicity

FFY 2013	# in All Settings	# in Typical Setting	# in Separate special education class, school, or residential facility	% in Typical Setting	% in Separate Setting
Asian	245	110	59	44.9%	24.1%
Black	291	176	41	60.5%	14.1%
Hispanic	2541	1116	648	43.9%	25.5%
Native American	154	74	18	48.0%	11.7%
White	6503	2420	1600	37.2%	24.6%
Multi-racial	345	141	83	40.9%	24.1%

Data Source: FFY 2013 Table 3 Part B, Section C: Race/Ethnicity of Children with Disabilities Ages 3-5 by Educational Environment.

B6: Early Childhood Special Education by Highest/Lowest Percent of Children in Typical Settings in Geographic Areas (County and one Tribal Reservation) of the State

County	Regular Setting	Separate Setting	Total ECSE	Regular ECSE %	Separate ECSE %
Highest					
Gilliam/Sherman/Wheeler	8	0	10	80.0%	0.0%
Harney	12	0	15	80.0%	0.0%
Crook	14	0	17	82.4%	0.0%
Lowest					
Lincoln	*	33	73	5.5%	45.2%
Malheur	*	22	64	7.8%	34.4%
Douglas	11	44	125	8.8%	35.2%

Data Source: Oregon Department of Education System Performance Review and Improvement Database

* The number was too few to report.

Setting Data Summary:

In FFY 2013, most (96.5%) infants and toddlers with IFSPs received early intervention services at home or in community-based settings. The percent of children receiving services in home or community based settings by disabilities ranged from 93.0% (Orthopedically Impaired) to 97.1% (Vision Impaired). The percent of children receiving services in home or community based settings by race/ethnicity ranged from 85.3% (American Indian or Alaskan Native) to 97.2% (Hispanic/Latino).

In FFY 2013, Oregon provided 40.0% of services for children age 3 to 5 years old (including children who are 5 years old in kindergarten) in regular early childhood programs and 24.3% of services in separate special education classes, separate schools, or residential facilities. The percent of children receiving the majority of ECSE services in regular early childhood settings by disabilities ranged from 29.0% (Intellectual Disability) to 52.3% (Emotional Disturbance). The percent of children receiving services in regular early childhood settings by race/ethnicity ranged from 37.2% (White) to 60.5% (Black).

Child Outcomes

The following tables show EI and ECSE child outcome data for children exiting the program having received at least 6 months of service. Data are reported to OSEP in three outcome areas and two groupings: 1) children showing greater than expected outcomes and 2)

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

children exiting the program within age expectations. For the purposes of the SIMR, Oregon selected the grouping of children showing greater than expected outcomes because it focuses on children leaving EI and ECSE services having narrowed or closed the developmental gap. The data were disaggregated by disability, race/ethnicity and geographic area.

C3 and B7 – Oregon Child Outcomes (five year average 2009-2013)

	<p>C3: Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited EI 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.</p>	<p>B7: Of those children who entered or exited ECSE below age expectations in each outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.</p>
Five Year Average: 2009-13	-	-
Positive social emotional skills	82.4%	77.9%
Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	60.8%	56.1%
Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	65.3%	44.0%

Data Source: Oregon ecWeb FFY 2013 Child Outcome Data, 10/2/13, Statewide 10/02/14 analysis of entry/exit test pairs.

C3:EI Child Outcomes by Disability

FFY 2013	Social Emotional Skills	Acquisition of Knowledge and Skills	Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet their Needs
State Targets	81.4%	64.2%	64.9%
Developmental Delay N= 1,813	83.4%	63.0%	67.0%
Hearing Impairment N= 56	69.7%	21.6%	42.2%

Data Source: Oregon ecWeb FFY 2013 Child Outcome Data, 10/2/13, Statewide 10/02/14 analysis of entry/exit test pairs.

C3: EI Child Outcomes by Race/Ethnicity

FFY 2013	Social Emotional Skills	Acquisition of Knowledge and Skills	Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet their Needs
----------	-------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

State Targets	81.45%	64.2%	64.9%
White	83.2%	61.3%	65.8%
N= 1742			
Black	87.0%	65.9%	71.9%
N= 92			
Asian	83.0%	69.3%	72.8%
N= 92			
Pacific Islander	55.0%	42.9%	61.9%
N= 21			
American Indian	77.4%	54.0%	58.1%
N= 64			
Hispanic	81.4%	62.7%	67.0%
N=456			

Data Source: Oregon ecWeb FFY 2013 Child Outcome Data, 10/2/13, Statewide 10/02/14 analysis of entry/exit test pairs.

C3: EI by Highest/Lowest Percent of Children achieving Child Outcomes by Geographic Areas (Counties and one Tribal Reservation) of the State

FFY 2013	Highest Three Counties/Tribal Reservation	Percentage	Lowest Three Counties	Percentage
Social Emotional Skills	Deschutes	96.5% (55/57)	Jefferson	44.4%*
	Klamath	95.7% (44/46)	Morrow	50.0%*
	Polk	95.7% (22/23)	Wasco	50.0%*
Target 81.4%				
Acquisition and use of Knowledge and Skills	Coos	79.3% (23/29)	Hood River	23.1%*
	Yamhill	75.0% (24/32)	Jefferson	25.0%*
Target 64.2%				

Tillamook 72.7% (8/11) Morrow 30.0%*

Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs

Polk 78.3% (22/28) Morrow 30.0%*

Target: 64.9%

Deschutes 78.3% (54/69) Benton 33.3%*

Warm Springs 77.9% (7/9) Wasco 33.3%*

Data Source: Oregon ecWeb FFY 2013 Child Outcome Data, 10/2/13, Statewide 10/02/14 analysis of entry/exit test pairs.

* The numbers were too few to report.

B7: ECSE Outcomes by Disability

FFY 2013	Social Emotional Skills	Acquisition of Knowledge and Skills	Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet their Needs
State Targets	74.8%	61.0%	45.3%
Autism N= 190	73.2%	55.3	51.1%
Communication Disorder N= 1636	72.8%	53.5%	36.2%
Developmental Delay N= 930	78.9%	58.3%	48.4%
Hearing Impairment N= 34	50.0%	27.3%	23.3%
Other Health Impaired N= 60	69.6%	67.2%	53.6%
Orthopedic Impairment N= 20	52.6%	40.0%	30.0%
Vision Impairment N= 13	92.3%	53.8%	61.5%

Data Source: Oregon ecWeb FFY 2013 Child Outcome Data, 10/2/13, Statewide 10/02/14 analysis of entry/exit test pairs.

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
B7: ECSE Child Outcomes by Race/Ethnicity**

FFY 2013	Social Emotional Skills	Acquisition of Knowledge and Skills	Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs
State Targets	74.8%	61.0%	45.3%
White N= 2660	74.9%	56.1%	43.8%
Black N= 125	79.6%	47.4%	33.3%
Asian N= 102	74.4%	48.8%	39.3%
Pacific Islander N= 26	87.0%	56.5%	36.8%
American Indian N= 102	77.6%	57.3%	41.4%
Hispanic N= 702	73.5%	59.1%	39.1%

Data Source: Oregon ecWeb FFY 2013 Child Outcome Data, 10/2/13, Statewide 10/02/14 analysis of entry/exit test pairs.

B7: ECSE by Highest/Lowest Percent of Children achieving Child Outcomes by Geographic Areas (Counties and one Tribal Reservation) of the State

FFY 2013	Highest Three Counties/Tribal Reservation	Percentage	Lowest Three Counties	Percentage
Social Emotional Skills	Deschutes	98.1% (53/54)	Baker	50.0%*
Target 74.8%	Lincoln	92.3% (24/26)	Douglas	60.7% (17/28)
	Josephine	89.5% (34/38)	Jefferson	61.1% (11/18)

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

Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills

Deschutes	90.7% (49/54)	Warm Springs	27.3%*
Target 61.0%			

Union	77.9% (7/9)	Columbia	37.5% (9/24)
Jefferson	72.2% (13/18)	Wasco	41.7% (10/24)

Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs

Deschutes	92.6% (50/54)	Lake	16.7%*
-----------	---------------	------	--------

Target: 45.3%

Crook	66.7% (4/6)	Douglas	21.4%*
Hood River	57.1% (8/14)	Columbia	21.7%

Data Source: Oregon ecWeb FFY 2013 Child Outcome Data, 10/2/13, Statewide 10/02/14 analysis of entry/exit test pairs.

* The numbers were too few to report.

Data Analysis

Data conclusions for Child Outcomes, Summary Statement 1, Outcomes A and B (2013 data): Children showing greater than expected growth in social emotional and acquisition of knowledge and skills.

Early Intervention (EI)

- Statewide race/ethnicity disaggregates for social emotional show the highest performers to be Asians (83.0%), Blacks (87.0%) and Whites (83.2%) whereas lowest were Hispanics (81.4%), American Indians (77.4%) and Pacific Islanders (55.0%). All race/ethnicity categories, except for Pacific Islander, were performing at or near the statewide target of 81.4%. The statewide average was 82.7%
- Statewide race/ethnicity disaggregates for acquisition of knowledge and skills show the highest performers to be Asians (69.3%), Blacks (65.9%), Whites (61.3%), and Hispanics (62.7%) whereas lowest were Pacific Islanders (42.9%) and American Indians (54.0%). All race/ethnicity categories, except for Pacific Islanders and American Indians, were performing at or near the statewide target of 64.2%. The statewide average was 61.2%.
- Statewide data disaggregated by disability category for EI do not reveal much information. Six children were identified with autism eligibility (too small of an "n"), 56 with the hearing impairment eligibility, and the rest with developmental delay eligibility. In social emotional skills, where the state performance was 82.7%, the performance of children with hearing impairment was 69.7% and children with developmental delay was 83.4%. In acquisition of knowledge and skills, where the state performance was 61.2%, the performance of children with hearing impairment was 21.6% and the children with developmental delay was 63.0%.
- In social emotional skills, where the target was 81.4%, data disaggregated by county revealed the highest three counties as Deschutes (96.5%), Klamath (95.7%), and Polk (95.7%) and the lowest three counties as Jefferson (44.4%), Morrow, (50.0%), and Wasco (50.0%).
- For acquisition of knowledge and skills, where the target was 64.2%, data disaggregated by county revealed the highest three counties as Coos (79.3%), Yamhill (75.0%), and Tillamook (72.7%) and the lowest three counties as Hood River (23.1%), Jefferson (25.0%), and Morrow (30.0%).
- For race/ethnicity, the gap for social emotional skills is significant between Blacks and Pacific Islanders (27.7%). The gap for acquisition of knowledge and skills is significant between Asians and Pacific Islanders (26.4%).

- Race ethnicity gaps were larger in the EI data than they were in the ECSE data.

Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE)

- Statewide race/ethnicity disaggregates for social emotional skills show the highest performers to be Pacific Islanders (87.0%), Blacks (79.6%) and American Indians (77.6%) whereas lowest were Hispanics (73.5%), Whites (74.9%) and Asians (74.4%). All race/ethnicity categories were performing at or near the statewide target of 74.8%. The statewide average was 75.1%.
- Statewide race/ethnicity disaggregates for acquisition of knowledge and skills show the highest performers to be Pacific Islanders (56.5%), American Indians (57.3%), Hispanics (59.1%) and Whites (56.1%) whereas lowest were Blacks (47.4%) and Asians (48.8%). All race/ethnicity categories were performing at or near the statewide target of 61.0%. The statewide average was 55.6%.
- Statewide data disaggregated by disability category for ECSE had large enough “n’s” in seven eligibilities categories for the data to be considered reliable: Autism (190), Communication Disorder (1636), Developmental Delay (930), Hearing Impairment (34), Other Health Impairment (60), Orthopedic Impairment (20), and Vision Impairment (13). In social emotional skills, where the state performance was 75.1% and the target was 74.8%, disability categories that were above target were Developmental Delay (78.9%) and Vision Impairment (92.3%) and those that were below target were Autism (73.2%), Communication Disorder (72.8%), Hearing Impairment (50.0%), Other Health Impairment (69.6%), and Orthopedic Impairment (52.6%). For acquisition of knowledge and skills, where the state performance was 55.6% and the target was 61.0%, the disability category above target was Other Health Impairment (67.2%) and those that were below target were Autism (55.3%), Communication Disorder (53.5%), Developmental Delay (58.35), Hearing Impairment (27.3%), Vision Impairment (53.8%), and Orthopedic Impairment (40.0%).
- In social emotional skills, where the target was 74.8%, data disaggregated by county revealed the highest three counties as Deschutes (98.1%), Lincoln (92.3%) and Josephine (89.5%) and the lowest three counties as Baker (50.0%), Douglas (60.7%), and Jefferson (61.1%). For acquisition of knowledge and skills, where the target was 61.0%, data disaggregated by county revealed the highest three counties as Deschutes (90.7%), Union (77.8%), and Jefferson (72.2%), and the lowest three counties as Warm Springs (27.3%), Columbia (37.5%), and Wasco (41.7%).
- The gap for social emotional skills was modest between Blacks and Hispanics (13.5%). The gap for acquisition of knowledge and skills was modest between American Indians and Blacks (9.9%).

Patterns or variations of data by programs:

- The five largest programs, Clackamas, Lane, Marion, Multnomah, and Washington counties, consistently performed near the state averages and targets.
- When comparing counties, Deschutes was the highest performer and Jefferson was the lowest performer. These two programs are served by the same contractor and are geographically located next to each other.

Kindergarten Assessment

Oregon’s Kindergarten Assessment was implemented statewide beginning in fall 2013.

The assessment measures skills in four domains:

- 1) Approaches to Learning (self-regulation, interpersonal skills),
- 2) Early Mathematics,
- 3) Letter Names, and
- 4) Letter Sounds.

The Kindergarten Assessment 2013 data (most recent data) were reviewed and disaggregated by race/ethnicity, gender, economically disadvantaged, limited English proficient and disability in a “Look Back” report issued by ODE in December 2014.

Oregon Kindergarten Assessment

	Approaches to Learning		Early Mathematics	Early Literacy
		Interper-sonal Skills		
		Self-Regulation	Numbers & Operations	Letter Names Letter Sounds
2013		Total		

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

Sub-Group	Ave. Rating	Ave. Rating	Ave. Rating	Ave. Num		Ave. Num		Ave. Num		
	(1-5)	(1-5)	(1-5)	Correct	(0-16)	Correct	(0-100)	Correct	(0-110)	
				N	N	N	N	N	N	
<i>State</i>	3.5	3.9	3.6	41,333	38.0	40,679	18.5	40,729	6.7	40,358
<i>Asian</i>	3.8	4.1	3.9	1394	9.4	1386	29.9	1399	12.3	1395
<i>Black</i>	3.3	3.7	3.5	984	7.2	959	19.1	977	6.2	971
<i>Hispanic</i>	3.4	3.9	3.6	10,056	6.8	9606	9.8	9513	2.9	9341
<i>American Indian</i>	3.3	3.8	3.5	561	7.2	542	14.5	550	4.7	547
<i>Pacific Islander</i>	3.4	3.8	3.5	322	7.0	311	14.7	315	4.2	311
<i>Multi-ethnic</i>	3.6	3.9	3.7	2304	8.4	2285	21.3	2306	7.9	2295
<i>White</i>	3.6	3.9	3.7	25,713	8.4	25,590	20.9	25,669	7.8	25,498
<i>Female</i>	3.7	4.1	3.8	20,155	8.0	19,847	19.2	19,873	7.1	19,692
<i>Male</i>	3.3	3.7	3.5	21,179	8.0	20,832	17.8	20,856	6.4	20,666
<i>Economically Disadvantaged</i>	3.4	3.8	3.5	22,259	7.3	21,567	13.4	21,575	4.0	21,297
<i>Limited English Proficient</i>	3.4	3.9	3.6	7823	6.5	7325	7.3	7317	1.8	7184
<i>Students with Disabilities</i>	2.9	3.4	3.1	3991	6.9	3722	12.1	3831	3.3	3788

Data Source: "Look Back" report issued by ODE in December 2014

Children with disabilities scored noticeably lower than the state average on all domains except for letter naming. The discrepancy in scores for students with disabilities in the "Approaches to Learning" domain emphasizes the need for Oregon to focus on social emotional skills and acquisition and use of knowledge and skills while children with disabilities receive EI and ECSE services. This focus may increase the approaches to learning skills of these children and in turn improve their skills in early mathematics and early literacy in kindergarten and the primary grades.

Third Grade Reading

Third Grade Reading Assessment: Percent of Students

Meeting or Exceeding State Benchmark

2011-2013	2011	2012	2013
All Students	70%	66%	66%
Students with Disabilities	36%	33%	32%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	58%	55%	54%
Asian/Pacific Islander	78%	74%	72%
Black	53%	50%	48%

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

Hispanic	50%	45%	45%
White	77%	74%	74%
Multi-Racial	76%	72%	71%
Asian	(no data)	78%	76%

Data Source: FFY 2011-2013 Statewide Assessment Performance Data by Race/Ethnicity

These data were obtained from the Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (Oregon's statewide assessment) results issued in August 2013 and August 2014. On the 2013 statewide assessment for reading, 66% of all third grade students met or exceeded the state target. In that same year, only 32% of children with disabilities met or exceeded the target – a gap of 34 percentage points. While data for all students show a downward trajectory over the last three years, the data for students with disabilities are considerably lower than all subgroups.

Root Cause Analysis:

In addition to disaggregating by disability, race/ethnicity and geographic area, Oregon's outcome data were compared with most current national data. Oregon's performance compared to national data are found in the following tables:

C3: Early intervention Outcomes

Summary Statement	Social Emotional Skills		Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills		Use of Appropriated Behaviors to Meet Their Needs	
	Oregon	National	Oregon	National	Oregon	National
1	82.7%	65.0%	61.2%	70.0%	65.9%	71.0%
2	59.6%	59.0%	9.2%	50.0%	14.7%	57.0%

Data Source: Oregon Data: FFY 2013 APR (2013 data). National Data: Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report 2014 Indicator Analyses (2012 data).

B7: Early Childhood Special Education Outcomes

Summary Statement	Social Emotional Skills		Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills		Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs	
	Oregon	National	Oregon	National	Oregon	National
1	75.1%	81.0%	55.5%	80.0%	43.3%	80.0%
2	30.8%	60.0%	24.0%	52.0%	30.4%	64.0%

Data Source: Oregon Data: FFY 2013 APR (2013 data). National Data: Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report 2014 Indicator Analyses (2012 data).

As seen in the tables, for Summary Statement 1, social emotional skills, Oregon scored above the national mean for C3 and below the national mean for B7. Oregon scored below the national mean for acquisition and use of knowledge and skills and use of appropriate behavior to meet their needs for both C3 and B7. For summary statement 2, Oregon scored slightly above the national mean for C3 social emotional skills and below the national mean for C3 and B7 for acquisition and use of knowledge and skills and use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

There are large discrepancies between Oregon's scores in Outcomes A, B, and C. Data quality concerns (reviewed in Section 1c) may have resulted in scores that do not accurately reflect child performance in Oregon and calls for improving the data quality. Given these issues, the outcome data may indicate that children exit EI and ECSE services with disparate skills that could impact kindergarten

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

readiness. Consideration of these data along with kindergarten assessment results and third grade benchmark data for students with disabilities led Oregon to target social emotional skills and acquisition and use of knowledge and skills as the means for better preparing children with disabilities for kindergarten and subsequently improved success with reading by third grade.

Oregon uses the Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System (AEPS, further described in 1c of this section) for reporting EI and ECSE child outcomes to the federal Office of Special Education Programs. The area of acquisition and use of knowledge and skills as summarized on the AEPS includes a sub-set of skills often referred to as approaches to learning. These skills include object permanence, causality, problem solving, sequencing and recalling events. Research data on early childhood education and its impact on success in school indicates that instruction in approaches to learning have a strong correlation to improved reading scores in third grade. The following are significant findings from research that support this premise:

1. There is a positive relationship between approaches to learning skills and cognitive functioning (Floyd, Bergeron, Hamilton, & Para, 2010). Approaches to learning in preschoolers are relatively stable over a year's time and can be related to other positive preschool skills (McClelland, Acock, and Morrison, 2003). Approaches to learning are important for both academic success as well as success in life in general (Galinsky, 2010).
2. There is a predictive relationship between approaches to learning skills in preschool and kindergarten and academic performance in the primary grades (McClelland, Acock, & Morrison, 2006). Preschool children with good approaches to learning skills had better academic skills at the beginning of kindergarten as well as the end of second grade (McClelland, Morrison, & Holmes, 2000). Growth in approaches to learning predicted growth in emergent literacy, vocabulary, and math skills (McClelland, Cameron, Connor, Farris, Jewkes, & Morrison, 2007).
3. Approaches to learning skills can be taught and improved (Diamond, Barnett, Thomas, & Munro, 2007). A specific program, such as Tools of the Mind, can produce and increase in approaches to learning skills. (Diamond, Barnett, Thomas, and Munro, 2007). These skills can also be taught to children from all backgrounds, including those who have experienced poverty and toxic stress (Tough, 2012).

Identified root causes for low performance in children with disabilities in the areas of social emotional and approaches to learning (sub-group of acquisition of knowledge and skills) skills in both EI and ECSE Child Outcomes and the Kindergarten Assessment are attributed to the inconsistency of purposefully teaching these skills before children with disabilities enter school. While ODE has supported EI/ECSE programs implementing Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) and other strategies for teaching children with behavioral needs, programs have not focused on intentional teaching of social emotional and approaches to learning skills to children.

1c. Data Quality Concerns

The State reviewed the quality of the data and the adequacy of the State's plan for addressing any data quality concerns.

Oregon uses the Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System (AEPS) for reporting EI and ECSE outcomes to meet both OSEP requirements and provide data necessary for developing individual child programs. The AEPS is a formative assessment that measures fine motor, gross motor, expressive communication, receptive communication, cognitive, adaptive and social/emotional skills. Data are reported to OSEP in three outcome areas and two groupings: 1) children showing greater than expected outcomes and 2) children exiting the program within age expectations. Starting in 2007 Oregon used the ECO Center AEPS/Child Outcomes crosswalk and its 80% "same-age-peers" threshold for measuring child progress.

Continued discrepancies between Oregon and national data caused Oregon to rethink its data summary process. In the summer of 2013, Oregon conducted a nationwide survey of child outcome data collections to determine which states were using a single assessment, as well as which of those states were using the AEPS for reporting child outcome data.

Louisiana was the only state, other than Oregon, that used the AEPS as a single measure for child outcome data. Louisiana's outcome data more closely approximated the national data than did Oregon. The difference between Oregon's and Louisiana's use of the AEPS is that Louisiana used the Brookes AEPS/Child Outcomes crosswalk, which included the use of goals and objectives data and a 90% "same-age-peers" threshold for measuring child progress.

Using this information, Oregon conducted a study of its child outcome data system and concluded it was necessary to change its system. In spring 2014, Oregon adopted the Brookes AEPS child outcome crosswalk and began collecting data using the crosswalk in fall 2014. This revised system uses AEPS goal and objective scores from the AEPS I and II to determine the child outcomes for indicators B7 and C3. ODE anticipates that using the new crosswalk and all AEPS goals and objectives will improve Oregon's data accuracy.

1d. Compliance Data and barriers to improvement.

The State considered compliance data and the potential effect on improvement.

Oregon's compliance data indicates a high rate of compliance and correction of non-compliance. Infants, toddlers, and preschool children with disabilities are being identified and receiving services in a timely manner, and transition from Early Intervention to Early Childhood Special Education and from Early Childhood Special Education to kindergarten. The relationship between compliance and results data show no effect of non-compliance on improved child outcomes.

Indicator	5 year Average (FFY 2009-2013)
C1: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.	95.8%
C7: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within the 45-calendar day timeline.	99.6%
C8A: Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, nor more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday.	96.9%
C8B: Notified 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.	100.0%
C8C: Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family as 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.	92.6%
B11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent of initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a time frame within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that time frame.	98.0%
B12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	100.0%

Data Source: Oregon Annual Performance Report

1e. If additional data are needed.

If the State's plan includes collecting additional data there is a description of the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

There are two areas of data identified as needing improvement.

EI and ECSE Child Outcome Data

Oregon is developing a fourth outcome category of AEPS items from a combination of goals and objectives collected for social emotional skills and selected goals and objectives collected for acquisition and use of knowledge and skills. This fourth outcome category will be aligned with the approaches to learning skills described in current research. It will encompass social emotional skills as well as cognitive skills directly related to approaches to learning (i.e., object permanence and causality for infants and toddlers and recalling events, problem solving, and sequencing for preschool age children). Implementation of the fourth "Approaches to Learning" category will be used in Phase II of the SSIP to provide a more accurate measure of Oregon's SIMR.

Oregon Kindergarten Assessment Data

Currently, the only disability data available from the Oregon Kindergarten Assessment are those that include students identified with a disability during their kindergarten year. Oregon is working on a process to disaggregate the data by children who received ECSE the year before kindergarten. The process involves matching children by Secure Student Identifier (SSID) with the kindergarten assessment data. We anticipate that this process will be functional in Phase II of the SSIP.

1f. Stakeholder involvement in the data analysis.

Multiple internal and external stakeholders were involved in the process to select, identify, and analyze existing data.

Stakeholder involvement in the analysis of the data occurred on multiple occasions during FFY 2013 and FFY 2014. During the annual Oregon Department of Education, Office of Learning, Student Services large stakeholder meeting on November 7, 2013, information concerning the upcoming SSIP writing process was shared. Sixty-three stakeholders from EI/ECSE programs, school districts, education service districts, other state agencies, community groups and higher education provided feedback and guidance on how data for the SSIP for Part C and Part B should be examined.

At the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) meeting on November 22, 2013, plans for the development of the SSIP were presented to the attendees. Participant questions were answered and feedback on the SSIP was provided to ODE at this meeting.

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

In 2014, the Associate Superintendent, Office of Learning, Student Services conducted a series of meetings with school districts and EI/ECSE programs throughout Oregon. One of the agenda items of these meetings was the discussion of the B17 and C11 SSIPs. The meetings occurred on the following dates and locations:

- May 16 ~ 9-11:30: Douglas ESD-Roseburg including Douglas, Coos, Curry, Jackson, Josephine, Klamath, and Lake
- May 30 ~ 9-11:30: Intermountain ESD-Pendleton including Umatilla, Morrow, Baker, Union, Malheur, Grant, and Wallowa
- June 4 ~ 9-11:30: High Desert ESD-Redmond including Jefferson, Crook, Deschutes, Harney, Gilliam, Wheeler, and Sherman
- September 25 ~ 1-3:30: NW Regional ESD-Hillsboro including Clatsop, Columbia, Tillamook, Washington, Marion, Polk, and Yamhill
- October 7 ~ 9-11:30: LBL ESD-Albany including Linn, Benton, Lincoln, and Lane
- October 10 ~ 9-11:30: Clackamas ESD-Clackamas including Clackamas, Multnomah, Hood River, and Wasco

On August 18, 2014, an all-day EI/ECSE SSIP small stakeholders meeting was held to analyze data and state infrastructure. Stakeholders reviewed focused data that were the results of the internal ODE data analysis. Discussions centered on the ODE data analysis, a description of the SSIP, data quality issues, the potential SIMR, and how to analyze the data. Stakeholders at this meeting and subsequent meetings represented a wide range of personnel representing agencies and programs serving children in Oregon including:

- State Head Start Collaboration Director
- Oregon Department of Education, Acting Early Learning System Director
- Oregon Health Authority, Child Health Director
- University of Oregon, Center on Human Development Director
- Local Early Learning Hub Director
- State Home Visiting Program, Public Health Nurse
- EI/ECSE Area Contractor and Local School District Student Services Director
- State Interagency Coordinating Council Chair (and Parent Representative)
- State Interagency Coordinating Council Parent Representative
- Local School District Student Services Director
- State Advisory Council on Special Education member
- Local EI/ECSE Service Provider
- Local School District Student Services Assistant Director
- Early Learning Division Quality Improvement Manager
- Oregon Department of Education, EI/ECSE Director
- Oregon Department of Education, EI/ECSE Education Specialists
- Oregon Department of Education, School Age Education Specialists

The Oregon Department of Education EI/ECSE staff meets bimonthly with EI/ECSE contractors to discuss ongoing projects, upcoming state initiatives, and policy issues. The SSIP was presented and discussed at all (September 17, 2014; January 21, 2015; and March 18, 2015) EI/ECSE contractor meetings. Data analysis information was presented during the meetings, with those in attendance expressing their support for the SSIP work.

Every October, Oregon Department of Education EI/ECSE and school age special education staff provides training and technical assistance to school districts, educational service districts and EI/ECSE programs throughout the state. Topics focus on the use of Oregon's System Performance and Review and Improvement monitoring mechanism, SPP/APR indicators, and issues related to general supervision. The October 2013 training included a review of the data from all SPP/APR indicators to solicit input for targets and strategies for the next five-year SPP/APR as well as a presentation of the SSIP and a discussion of a proposed area of focus for the SIMR. The October 2014 training included a review of the SSIP, and the data that led to the proposed SIMR. Dates and sites for these sessions were:

- October 7, 2014 – Salem, OR
- October 9, 2014 – Oregon City, OR
- October 14, 2014 – Redmond, OR
- October 16, 2014 – Baker City, OR
- October 21, 2014 – Eugene, OR
- October 23, 2014 – Ashland, OR
- October 28, 2014 – Hillsboro, OR

The Oregon Department of Education Office of Learning/Student Services holds a general stakeholder meeting each November. Invitees include parents, representatives of school districts, EI/ECSE service providers, education service districts, higher education, charter schools, private schools, and state agencies. Members of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) and the State Advisory Council for Special Education (SACSE) also participate. The focus of the November 7, 2014 stakeholder meeting was the presentation of the ODE data analysis in the framework of the SSIP. Feedback from the participants concerning their support of the data analysis, infrastructure analysis, and the proposed SIMR for the Part C (EI/ECSE) and Part B SSIP was gathered via a discussion and written poll. Thirty of the thirty-one stakeholders chose to fill out the poll with 30 respondents indicating support for the SSIP process and the proposed SIMR.

A joint State Interagency Coordinating Committee and State Advisory Council for Special Education meeting took place on March 12,

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

2015. Stakeholder from both of these groups reviewed the final SSIP and Theory of Action for both Part C and Part B. All stakeholders expressed support for the plans.

References

- Diamond, A., Barnett, W., Thomas, J., & Munro, S. (2007). Preschool program improves cognitive control. *Science*, 318 (5855), 1387-1388.
- Floyd, R., Bergeron, R., Hamilton, G., & Parra, G. (2010). How do executive functions fit with the Cattell–Horn–Carroll model? Some evidence from a joint factor analysis of the Delis–Kaplan Executive Function System and the Woodcock–Johnson III tests of cognitive abilities. *Psychology in the Schools*, 47(7), 721-738.
- Galinsky, E. (2010). *Mind in the Making: The Seven Essential Life Skills Every Child Needs*. Harper Collins, New York.
- McClelland, M., Acock, A., & Morrison, F. (2003). The emergence of learning-related social skills in preschool children. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 18(2), 206-224.
- McClelland, M., Acock, A., & Morrison, F. (2006). The impact of kindergarten learning-related skills on academic trajectories at the end of elementary school. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 21(4), 471-490.
- McClelland, M., Cameron, C., Connor, C., Farris, C., Jewkes, A., & Morrison, F. (2007). Links between behavioral regulation and preschooler's literacy, vocabulary, and math skills. *Developmental Psychology*, 43(4), 947-959.
- McClelland, M., Morrison, F., & Holmes, D. (2000). Children at risk for early academic problems: the role of learning related social skills. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 15(3), 307-329.
- Tough, Paul (2012). *How children succeed: Grit Curiosity, and the Hidden Power of Character*. Houghton, Mifflin, & Harcourt, New York.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

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

INFRASTRUCTURE ANALYSIS

Overview

2(a) A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in EIS providers to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. OSEP will consider the extent to which:

The State engaged in a systematic process to analyze the capacity of the State infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity at the local level in relation to the SIMR.

The Infrastructure Analysis phase of the SSIP development began with an examination of materials and tools from OSEP and other SSIP technical assistance partners. ODE met with Western Regional Resource Center staff in May of 2014 to better understand the scope of the infrastructure analysis and to learn about resource tools available for use. Internal meetings with Student Services educational specialists and directors were held in June 2014 and July 2014 to hone understanding of the analysis and to generate informational lists regarding ODE's current infrastructure, focusing on governance and leadership, fiscal organization, quality standards, professional development for educational staff, information technology and accountability. Specific state initiatives were identified, as well as their connection to ODE's Strategic Plan goals. Funded priorities by the Legislature were also highlighted. This process generated a list of initiatives, delineated governance connections, and identified stakeholder agencies and others to include in the ongoing process of infrastructure analysis. In preparation for stakeholder meetings, ODE researched partner programs and agencies to identify each agency's structure, strategic plans, goals, and improvement activities related to results for children and families.

In August 2014, a small stakeholder group was convened to broaden the infrastructure analysis through a guided discussion of similarities and differences in governance, strategic plans or program goals, and improvement activities related to children and families. Common initiatives and goals regarding child outcomes were identified. All participants commented on the value of the meeting, and requested updates on the progress of the work. Stakeholders at this meeting and subsequent meetings represented a wide range of personnel representing agencies and programs serving children in Oregon including:

- State Head Start Collaboration Director

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

- Oregon Department of Education, Acting Early Learning System Director
- Oregon Health Authority, Child Health Director
- University of Oregon, Center on Human Development Director
- Local Early Learning Hub Director
- State Home Visiting Program, Public Health Nurse
- EI/ECSE Area Contractor and Local School District Student Services Director
- State Interagency Coordinating Council Chair (and Parent Representative)
- State Interagency Coordinating Council Parent Representative
- Local School District Student Services Director
- State Advisory Council on Special Education Member
- Local EI/ECSE Service Provider
- Local School District Student Services Assistant Director
- Early Learning Division Quality Improvement Manager
- Oregon Department of Education, EI/ECSE Director
- Oregon Department of Education, EI/ECSE Education Specialists
- Oregon Department of Education, School Age Education Specialists

Oregon strives for success and excellence in developing a world class education system that starts early and achieves results. In 2010, the state adopted the 40-40-20 goal: by 2025, 40% of adult Oregonians will earn a bachelor's degree or higher, 40% will earn an associate's degree or post-secondary credential, and 20% will earn a high school diploma or equivalent. To achieve those goals, ODE developed a Strategic Plan starting with biennial goals in 2013-15. The Strategic Plan provides a solid foundation for infrastructure analysis and is highlighted below, as the connection to Oregon's SIMR will be vitally important.

ODE's Strategic Plan:

- Goal 1 (Learners): Every student graduates from high school and is ready for college, career, and civic life.
 - Integrate early learning programs across the relevant state agencies so every student enters kindergarten ready to learn.
 - Implement statewide literacy programs so all students read by third grade.
 - Design and implement an integrated and comprehensive system to ensure every student graduates ready for college, career, and civic life.
 - Help districts implement effective practices in order to close achievement gaps.
 - Improve quality of special education services to close achievement gaps.
- Goal 2 (Educators): Every P-12 organization is led by an effective administrator, and every student is taught by an effective teacher.
 - Help districts implement the new educator evaluation system, and start to connect evaluation results to meaningful professional development.
 - Launch Quality Teaching and Learning Network focused on developing exceptional educators and implementing effective practices.
 - Close the educator equity gap to ensure equitable distribution of the most effective educators and have educators reflect the student population.
 - Work with OEIB and TSPC to improve the preparation, licensure, retention, and effectiveness of new educators.
- Goal 3 (Schools and Districts): Increase performance for all schools and districts in order to create systems of excellence across the state.
 - Systematically help districts implement Common Core, Next Generation Standards, and new statewide assessments.
 - Identify and improve Oregon's chronically underperforming schools.
 - Measure, analyze, and report out Oregon's progress to 40/40/20.
 - Ensure districts provide healthy and safe learning environments for students.
 - Conduct all federal compliance and on-site monitoring visits in a positive and respectful way that leads to improved outcomes for students.
- Goal 4 (Communities): ODE meaningfully engages parents, stakeholders, and the larger community to help make Oregon's schools the best in the country.
 - Prioritize building and maintaining partnerships with historically underserved communities.
 - Provide clear and timely information to customers and stakeholders.
 - Proactively inform and engage the legislature and implement 2013 and 2014 legislation.
 - Proactively and strategically work with relevant state agencies to deliver services for students' and families' overall well-being, so schools can attend to students' educational needs.
- Goal 5 (ODE): Make ODE the best place to work.
 - Attract, retain, and develop top talent to ODE.
 - Increase diversity of ODE's workforce.
 - Reorganize ODE to ensure integration and collaboration across all offices.
 - Deliver excellent internal customer service and improve communication and efficiency within ODE.

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

Each of these five goals, with its accompanying objectives and metrics is reviewed every six months to assess progress toward all outcomes. These stock takes, based on the model of U.S. Education Delivery Institute, use a systematic process by which education leaders can drive progress and deliver results.

Currently, leadership staff at ODE are reviewing and re-working the strategic plan for 2015-2017. The goals and objectives for Learners (Goal 1) will remain, with an increased and intensive focus on all students entering kindergarten ready to learn and reading by third grade. The Governor's Budget, having been presented to the Legislature, includes funds for early childhood investments (\$135 million), all-day kindergarten for all students across the state, as well as intentional support for students K-3 who struggle with literacy and reading skills (\$85 million combined for both projects).

State Infrastructure System Description

2(b) A description of the State's systems infrastructure (at a minimum the governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring). OSEP will consider the extent to which:

The State analyzed all relevant systems within its infrastructure related to the SIMR.

Governance

Oregon's Department of Education (ODE) is organized to focus on teaching and learning. The Office of the Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction oversees the entire agency, inclusive of the Early Learning Division (ELD) and the Youth Development Division (YDD). The units within ODE are comprised of the Office of Research and Data Analysis, the Office of Learning (Equity, Student Services, and Instruction, Standards, Assessment and Accountability), the Office of Finance and Administration, and the Office of Informational Technology. ODE also works collaboratively with the Oregon Education and Investment Board, the State Board of Education and the Early Learning Council to implement and oversee education policy and programs for children and families P-20. The Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction sits as a non-voting member of the State Board and is a member of the Early Learning Council. Attached is ODE's organizational chart for reference.

In 2012, the Oregon Legislature passed legislation establishing an Early Learning Council (ELC) as the body to guide early learning and development programs in Oregon. The mission is to support Oregon's children to enter kindergarten ready to succeed; ensure their parents have the support and resources necessary that result in stable and attached families; and integrate resources and services statewide into a coordinated system for parents and families. In 2013, further legislation created the Early Learning Division within the Oregon Department of Education, streamlining Early Learning and Development Programs under one agency and codifying the transformation of the delivery system through the establishment of Early Learning Hubs.

Early Learning Hubs are community-based and community-owned coordinators of early learning services responsible for bringing together partners from early childhood, K12 education, health, human services and the business sectors around a common vision and shared measurable outcomes for children and families. The Early Learning Hubs are directed by statute to accomplish three specific goals: (1) create an early childhood system that is aligned, coordinated and family-centered; (2) ensure that children arrive at school ready to succeed; and (3) ensure that Oregon's young children live in families that are healthy, stable and attached.

ODE's Management Team is comprised of the Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Directors of ELD and YDD, six Assistant Superintendents, the Government and Legal Affairs Manager, and the Chief Information Officer. The team meets weekly to coordinate priorities, trouble-shoot areas of concerns and support the work of the agency. In addition, once a month, the Management Team meets with all Directors to share and communicate updates and changes, and to solicit feedback. Several smaller leadership teams meet regularly, such as the Office of Learning Assistant Superintendents and Unit Directors, to collaborate and to keep the focus on the priority initiatives and projects. Many educational staff work across offices and units to support complimentary projects. An example of this relates to Kindergarten Assessment work. The work team includes staff from Student Services (including EI/ECSE), Equity and Assessment, and Early Learning.

The Office of Learning, Student Services Unit oversees the EI/ECSE program and is separate from the Early Learning Division under the Oregon Department of Education. This requires formal and informal communication processes to assure an informed working partnership to meet the needs of all children in early childhood education settings. EI/ECSE works closely with the ELD through shared work on initiatives and ongoing communication via work groups and meetings. Currently, EI/ECSE and the ELD are working together on the Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge grant, universal developmental screening and age three to grade three transition.

The Oregon EI/ECSE program is a single system of EI and ECSE services for children birth to kindergarten. While there are some eligibility differences between EI and ECSE, the program is seamless in its delivery of services in an effort to minimize transitions for families. Most children who receive EI services continue to receive ECSE services at age three. An Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) that meets both Part B IEP requirements and Part C IFSP requirements is used to document services to children eligible for EI and ECSE services.

ODE works collaboratively with nine contractors (Education Service Districts/School Districts) and 36 Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) county programs on comprehensive data collection, analysis, performance reporting, improvement planning, implementation, and progress reporting. All services to children and families are provided directly by EI/ECSE contractors or their subcontractors. The majority of the subcontractors are ESDs or school districts. A major strength of the EI/ECSE system in Oregon is that it lies within the larger birth through 21 special education system and is embedded in general education programs to a very high degree (e.g., Head Start).

The Office of Finance and Administration provides the financial structural support needed for a large state-wide educational institution. Financial support is provided in the areas of accounting, budget and analysis, procurement services and program finance. Each of these sections has a director or lead staff who manages the projects, priorities and supervises staff. In addition, each program and grant is assigned a fiscal analyst who works closely with the director or lead staff in budget development, allocation, review, and reporting. This fiscal analyst is also an important member of internal audit functions. Regular meetings occur with fiscal analyst staff to monitor budget revenues and expenditures.

Federal Part C, Part B 619, and Part B 611 funds account for approximately 20% of the EI/ECSE budget. The remaining 80% comes from the State of Oregon General Fund through grant in aid. These funds (federal and state) are used to provide direct services to children with disabilities and their families. Many children with IFSPs also receive services from stakeholder programs. These programs provide direct services to children such as general preschool education, health services, and nutrition services. Partner programs include:

- Head Start (including Migrant Seasonal Head Start, Tribal Head Start, and Early Head Start)
- Oregon Pre-kindergarten – State funded pre-school
- Relief Nurseries
- Nurse-Family Partnership
- Healthy Start
- CaCoon – A statewide public health nurse home visiting program that focuses on community-based care coordination for children with special health needs.

Quality standards

A key element and strength of quality standards for early childhood programs in Oregon is the Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS). Oregon's Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) raises the quality and consistency of child care and early learning programs across the state and acts as a framework for Oregon's three categories of early childhood standards: child standards, workforce standards, and program standards.

Child Standards

In 2012, the Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework (HSCDELDF) was adopted as Oregon's early learning standards for child ages three to five. The HSCDELDF aligns with and expands on the five essential domains identified by the National Education Goals panel through 11 domains that "represent the overarching areas of child development and early learning essential for school and long-term success" including children who are English learners and those with disabilities.

In winter 2015, ODE assembled a multidimensional stakeholder group (including EI/ECSE representation) charged with aligning the HSCDELDF to Oregon's kindergarten learning standards. The process, completed by December 2015, will yield a clearly articulated set of developmental progressions for pre-kindergarten children, a set of core knowledge and skill indicators for children transitioning to kindergarten, clear alignment of developmental progressions and expectations for learning in Oregon's Early Learning Framework and Oregon's Academic Standards, and an aligned set of standards and guidance related to English learners, from age three to kindergarten.

Workforce Standards

The Oregon Registry is a professional development tracking system for the early childhood care and education workforce. Twelve levels of qualification are based on state standards called the Core Body of Knowledge. The system is used primarily by the childcare workforce but is meant to link all state systems. Most of Oregon's EI/ECSE workforce are professional staff, certified or licensed by specialty (EI/ECSE teachers, physical therapists, occupational therapists, speech therapists, etc.) boards. The program also has a state-level authorization process based on EI/ECSE competencies as an alternative for obtaining a qualified workforce. Some EI/ECSE staff, mostly teaching assistants, are on the Oregon Registry but that is not required for professional staff.

Program Standards

Oregon's Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) is a voluntary system using a set of progressively higher program standards to evaluate the quality of Early Learning and Development programs and support program improvement. Oregon's QRIS is designed to support early learning and development programs through high-quality tools, incentives, and professional advice; help parents and caregivers find early learning and development programs that meet their needs; and ensure that children have high-quality early learning experiences that help them develop the skills they need to be ready for Kindergarten and life.

EI/ECSE supports the QRIS initiative by working with its contractors to provide services to children with IFSPs in QRIS rated programs. Local EI/ECSE programs are encouraged to use 3, 4, and 5-star rated programs as community placements for EI/ECSE services.

Professional development

Professional development is a critical component of an educational system's work. This encompasses development of educator and administrative staff, with ongoing support and technical assistance.

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

funded technical assistance center, over the last fifteen months on its professional development with the EI/ECSE workforce. Technical assistance from UO helped Oregon develop a strategic work plan that included:

- Assessing the needs of EI/ECSE practitioners in Oregon; and
- Developing a crosswalk between Oregon EI/ECSE competencies with Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), and National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) to identify gaps and areas for revision.

The needs assessment was conducted with EI/ECSE supervisors to assess current training needs of EI/ECSE practitioners in Oregon. The assessment identified six top training needs. Some of the highest areas of need are similar to areas of high need within stakeholder agencies. Five of the top needs will be addressed in an intensive week long summer institute scheduled for June 2015. The five needs (all related to Oregon's coherent strategies) are 1) coaching early childhood providers; 2) providing interventions to children in the area of social emotional skills; 3) evidence-based practices in early literacy; 4) coaching parents; and 5) routine based (embedded) interventions.

The cross walk between Oregon EI/ECSE competencies with CEC and NAEYC competencies was recently completed and areas to consider for revision identified. The revisions will address gaps with national standards and address top training needs in Oregon. In addition, the competencies will be cross walked with the Oregon Registry Core Body of Knowledge state standards. The Oregon Registry is a professional development tracking system for the early childhood care and education workforce. The system is used primarily by the childcare workforce but is designed to link all state systems.

Data

The importance of quality data as tool of change cannot be underestimated. Data-driven decisions at the individual, classroom, program, regional and state levels are extremely important for increasing achievement or decreasing equity gaps. As described in the Data Analysis section, Oregon has a robust and collaborative statewide data system that informs statewide policy development, guides practice and is designed to meet federal reporting requirements. The EI/ECSE Unit uses the SPR&I data collection and monitoring system for special education data collections in concert with the larger, statewide system for all students.

All data collections have an assigned data owner and research analyst who work together to run the collection. Specific documentation guides or instructions are provided to all districts, as well as instruction via webinars and Power Points presentations. All collections have validation procedures to ensure the data are reliable and accurate. Testing of the data collection system or templates also takes place prior to opening of the data system. Data from the data systems are used for program review and monitoring (general supervision), completing required reports like the SPP/APR Part B and Part C making IDEA determinations to programs, and completing the annual EI/ECSE Report Card.

The EI/ECSE program has a database, called ecWeb, that collects child-level data for children receiving EI/ECSE services. All child outcome data are collected, stored and maintained in ecWeb. Child outcome data can be easily disaggregated by categories such as race/ethnicity, disability, local program, service levels, or child care/community preschools QRIS star rating.

Technical assistance

Technical assistance goes hand-in-hand with accountability and monitoring, and provides needed and requested opportunities to further review performance and achievement. The EI/ECSE Unit at ODE provides technical assistance to local programs and supports programs and partner agencies. The goal is to collaboratively and positively impact the educational lives of children and families in Oregon. The Offices of Learning, Early Learning Division, Finance and Administration, Informational Technology, Research and Data Analysis, and the Deputy Superintendent all have a model of technical assistance inclusive of on-site or in-person support, as well as use of technical/online methods to provide support. Program visits, regional meetings, webinars, and posted presentations are several of the ways ODE provides assistance to partners. In addition, regular communications, such as formal memorandums, newsletters and videos, provide important information and guidance.

ODE Student Services (including EI/ECSE) has developed systems of professional development and technical assistance through regional assignments. Educational Specialists are assigned as county contacts for all programs within a specific EI/ECSE area. This allows for efficient technical assistance and desired professional development sessions through regional support. The EI/ECSE Unit addresses many professional development needs, including topics on: Assessment Programming and Evaluation System, Ages and Stages Questionnaire, ecWeb database, monitoring and compliance indicators, services for students with disabilities, and state and federal regulations. Professional development and support on these topics is also provided to partner programs such as the Head Start and the Oregon Prekindergarten Program.

Every fall, Oregon EI/ECSE and school age special education staff provide training and technical assistance to school districts, educational service districts and EI/ECSE programs through-out the state. Topics focus on the use of Oregon's System Performance and Review and Improvement monitoring mechanism, SPP/APR indicators, and issues related to general supervision.

Accountability monitoring

The Oregon EI/ECSE program has a data-driven monitoring and accountability system based on the SPP/APR indicators and federal and state requirements for providing EI/ECSE services. Local EI/ECSE programs electronically submit improvement plans for under target indicators, which are reviewed, approved and monitored by ODE. Local EI/ECSE programs also electronically submit data on a sampling of EI, ECSE, and EI to ECSE transition files. These data are reviewed by ODE with out-of-compliance standards corrected by

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

file reviews and/or intervention activities. ODE utilizes the System Performance Review and Improvement (SPR&I) database to collect and disseminate data related to general supervision. Through SPR&I, ODE monitors local program implementation of EI/ECSE service delivery practices and procedures. All EI/ECSE programs are monitored annually and the SPR&I database reports provide comparisons to statewide data and program data. EI/ECSE programs have access to program specific measurable indicators for use in self-assessment, review, and documentation of evidence of change via program improvement plans. EI/ECSE programs review current practices in relation to compliance standards and performance profile data. Data analysis and interpretation are used to inform local improvement planning decisions and activities, and to correct any identified noncompliance.

2(c): A description of the current strengths, the extent the systems or coordinated, and areas for improvement within and across the systems.

Governance (Strengths/Areas for Improvement)

The governance structure of ODE and its offices focuses work on the Strategic Plan. All work is discussed through the lens of the mission and goals, with a focus on equity for all children. This strength leads to cohesive work streams, with a commitment to our collaborative goals. In addition, this laser focus leads to progress and achievement of goals, as efforts, resources and decision-making are filtered through the same lens.

Another strength is that all of the programs in Oregon's Early Learning System have common goals for children and families related to strengthening kindergarten readiness and in turn improving the third grade benchmark for literacy. For instance, one of the goals within the ODE strategic plan is Kindergarten Readiness. A core initiative of the Early Learning Division is Early Literacy and Kindergarten Readiness. A goal of the Home Visiting programs is improved school readiness and achievement. Kindergarten Readiness is also a goal of Coordinated Care Organizations within the Oregon Health Authority.

An area for continued improvement in an agency this large, is the tendency to silo work within different units as workload increases. Working independently with a small group of staff who work in close proximity to each other can be easy. A way that ODE is attempting to ameliorate this tendency is through specific cross-office teams, and weekly meetings of the Assistant Superintendents. Extra effort and awareness are critical to keep collaboration at the forefront of our work. Also, maintaining a balance between state agency rules and policies, and pragmatic work procedures is always important, so as not to get sidetracked or bogged down by administrative details.

Fiscal (Strengths/Areas for Improvement)

Fiscally, ODE itself, and the Offices supporting educational programs, are in a strong place to continue progress towards our 40-40-20 goal, with a focus on literacy and college-going skills. The Oregon Legislature has supported these goals by financing initiatives focusing specifically on early learning, early literacy and reading skills, as well as college-going skills through STEM and educator effectiveness programs (Common Core). The Legislature is currently poised to support additional funding to early childhood investments (including EI/ECSE), Age Three to Grade Three Literacy Program, and all-day Kindergarten.

An area for improvement in the fiscal component is funding of the EI/ECSE program. State and Federal funding has not kept pace with increased numbers of children, including children with more complex needs, and increasing personnel costs. Currently, ODE's budget request to the Oregon Legislature includes an additional \$15 M for improvements to the EI/ECSE program. ODE will know about its budget request at the end of the Legislative session in late June or early July of 2015.

Quality Standards (Strengths/Areas for Improvement)

The QRIS provides a framework to develop and improve community placements for children with disabilities. EI/ECSE personnel help support the QRIS by providing training to community partners on topics concerning children with disabilities or children in need of additional supports (e.g., positive behavior support and intervention, visual calendar systems, communication supports).

The process of merging workforce and program standards across early childhood systems is daunting. A key component of this work will be to make sure all teachers have skills to work with a range of child needs and incorporate universal design techniques. Keeping the needs of children with disabilities in the forefront of this work is crucial.

Professional Development (Strengths/Areas for Improvement)

Technical assistance from the University of Oregon (UO) through the Early Childhood Personnel Center (ECPC), a federally funded technical assistance center, has been critical to revitalizing professional development to EI/ECSE practitioners in Oregon. The work has led to refocused support to programs through intensive training such as the summer institute that we plan to continue.

Collaborating with stakeholders around common training topics is challenging. Coordinated communication regarding opportunities for early childhood partners to organize and support a program of professional development that meets the needs of all partners is necessary.

Data (Strengths/Areas for Improvement)

Tracking of child level data through ecWeb provides exceptional support for data-based decision making. Easy access to child outcome, IFSP and other program data increases our ability to quickly pinpoint problems and address concerns.

Connecting EI/ECSE child level data to school age data is challenging. We continue to work on ways for systems to talk to each other,

but the process is cumbersome. We continue to work on connecting the systems in ways that make data easily accessible.

Technical Assistance (Strengths/Areas for Improvement)

The transition of ODE from an agency solely focused on compliance and monitoring to one that combines quality education for children with achievement of results-driven outcomes has been met with approval from practitioners.

Technical assistance efforts are disjointed between EI/ECSE and its partners programs (Oregon Prekindergarten, Head Start, Home Visiting, etc.). One of the objectives within our Strategic Plan, Goal 3 is focused on coordinated technical assistance efforts and feedback loops. This is an area where improvement would assist in overall cohesion towards positive outcomes for children.

Accountability Monitoring (Strengths/Areas for Improvement)

This SSIP, a revised accountability system under the IDEA, shifts accountability efforts from a primary emphasis on compliance to a framework that focuses on improved results for children with disabilities, while continuing to assist in ensuring compliance with the IDEA's requirements. The emphasis will be on child outcomes to increase the achievement of children with disabilities. ODE has moved in this same direction with focused goals and objectives with determined metrics to measure the progress towards and achievement of our goals. This component is strong within the agency and the utilization of the Education Delivery Institute model of getting results will greatly support this SSIP.

Sometimes, competing agendas or emergency issues can cloud or temporarily de-rail work, even with focused and committed personnel. Adherence to our foundational model of delivering results will need remain front and center to our everyday work.

State-level Improvement Plans and Initiatives

2(d) The identification of current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including EIS and early care and education improvement plans and initiatives and the extent to which they are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with the SSIP. OSEP will consider the extent to which:

- *The State identified both EIS and early care and education initiatives that could impact the capacity of local programs and EIS providers to implement strategies that lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s).*
- *The State analyzed relevant State-level improvement plans and initiatives in relation to the SIMR.*

Oregon has the following initiatives which in their entirety or in part support the SIMR:

Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge

Oregon was a recipient of the federal "Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge" grant in December 2012. The grant is a vehicle to ensure Oregon children enter school ready to learn and succeed. Grant activities include:

- Increasing training and professional development to child care and education providers as a part of further developing the Oregon's Quality Rating and Improvement System;
- Providing professional development to support career pathways for early childhood educators to develop expertise in quality early learning and best practices;
- Providing dedicated outreach to build an informed, engaged public around quality early learning environments;
- Enhancing the QRIS data system; and,
- Launching a statewide Kindergarten Assessment.

Oregon Early Literacy Grants

In 2013, the legislature provided funding to strengthen early literacy among children ages 0-6 and with the intention of improving children's kindergarten readiness and third grade reading proficiency. With this funding, the Oregon Early Literacy Grant program was established and grants were awarded to programs across the state that have strong early literacy partnerships that build the capacity of adults to engage in high quality reading experiences with children, expand reading opportunities for children, increase the frequency with which children are read to in the home, and expand access to books, libraries, and/or materials and curriculum that promote early literacy.

Kindergarten Readiness Partnership and Innovation Grants

The Early Learning Kindergarten Partnership & Innovation grant fund was established in 2013 to increase the connection between early learning and K-12 education by investing in innovative and promising models for early learning/K-12 integration across the state; to build a body of evidence that Oregon can use to create stronger alignment between its early learning and K-12 education systems; and to promote community and school partnerships that result in measurable increases in children's readiness for kindergarten. Recipients of these grants include Early Learning Hubs, school districts, ESD's providers of early learning services, and non-profit organizations throughout the state.

Universal Developmental Screening

In July 2014, Oregon's Early Learning Council adopted the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) as the general development

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

screening to be used by early learning and development providers. The ASQ provides reliable, accurate developmental and social emotional screening for children between birth and age 6. Currently, early child care and educator providers in Oregon are receiving training on how to conduct the ASQ with parents and how to use the information to guide parents to appropriate services when appropriate.

P-3 Alignment

Oregon is currently investing in several high priority/high visibility initiatives designed to strengthen the alignment between early learning and K-3 education, to improve children's transition from early learning settings into kindergarten, and to ultimately invigorate K-3 instruction and supports to create a seamless system of education for all children in partnership with families.

HB 3232 in 2013-2015 focused on literacy skills in early childhood, as well as the 3rd grade reading benchmark. This initiative will continue, if approved by the Legislature, through the **Age Three to Grade Three Initiative** that specifically spans from age 3 to grade 3 (or 8-year-olds). While there are pockets of collaboration throughout the state between Early Learning and the K-12 system, this is the first time that ODE has laid out a plan, in a qualitative way, that ties it all together. Utilizing this strategy of combining an initiative between early childhood and school-age is an effective model as evidenced in other states, as well as in certain parts of Oregon. By having shared professional development, aligning of the academic and social emotional standards, and working on the transition from the early years to the early grades, we know this will make a difference for our children. Last year, Oregon had 68% of its students reading by third grade, with 32% of students not meeting that standard. Most of the students who were not successful were students of color, living in poverty or had disabilities. This indicates that students are not being identified early enough as needing more strategic intervention or support, or are just referred for special education services, which may not be appropriate. This comprehensive initiative is needed to significantly change the trajectory of students as they moved toward successful graduation and to teach our goal of 40-40-20. Specifically, the Age Three to Grade Three Literacy Initiative will support and enhance regional and local efforts to connect, integrate, and align early learning and K-12 systems, and help to prevent the opportunity and achievement gap.

Stakeholder Involvement

2(e) A list of representatives (e.g. offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) who were involved in the development of Phase I and will be involved in the development and implementation of Phase II of the SSIP.

Oregon is very proud of the involvement of many individuals and groups in the development of Phase I of its State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Stakeholders are invested in the outcome of the State Initiated Measurable Result, and have requested continued involvement with Phase II. Their contribution has been invaluable with all components, including data analysis, infrastructure analysis, determination of the SIMR and appropriate coherent strategies. Oregon's Theory of Action is constructed to meet our State's needs, specifically directed at increased social emotional and approaches to learning skills for children with disabilities. The following is a list of representatives who participated in Phase I of the SSIP for the past 16 months:

- Oregon Department of Education
- Early Learning Division: State Head Start Collaboration, Acting Early Learning System Director, Child Care Office, Quality Improvement Office
- Oregon Health Authority
- University of Oregon, Center on Human Development
- Local Early Learning Hubs
- State Home Visiting Programs
- Head Start
- Oregon Prekindergarten
- Migrant/Seasonal Head Start
- EI/ECSE Area Contractors
- EI/ECSE Service Providers: Teachers and Administrators
- State Interagency Coordinating Council
- Parents of Children with Disabilities
- Local School Districts: Teachers and Administrators
- State Advisory Council on Special Education
- Oregon Council on Developmental Disabilities
- Education Service Districts: Teachers and administrators
- Department of Human Services: Office of Developmental Disabilities

2(f) A description of stakeholder involvement in the analysis of the State's infrastructure. OSEP will consider the extent to which:

Multiple internal and external stakeholders were involved in analyzing the infrastructure.

Stakeholder involvement in the analysis of the data occurred on multiple occasions during FFY 2013 and FFY 2014. During the annual Oregon Department of Education, Office of Learning, Student Services large stakeholder meeting on November 7, 2013, information concerning the upcoming SSIP writing process was shared. Sixty-three stakeholders from EI/ECSE programs, school districts, education service districts, other state agencies, community groups and higher education provided feedback and guidance on how data for the SSIP for Part C and Part B should be examined.

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

presented to the attendees. Participant questions were answered and feedback on the SSIP was provided to ODE at this meeting.

In 2014, the Associate Superintendent, Office of Learning, Student Services conducted a series of meetings with school districts and EI/ECSE programs throughout the Oregon. One of the agenda items of these meetings was the discussion of the B17 and C11 SSIPs. The meetings occurred on the following dates and locations:

- May 16 ~ 9-11:30: Douglas ESD-Roseburg including Douglas, Coos, Curry, Jackson, Josephine, Klamath, and Lake
- May 30 ~ 9-11:30: Intermountain ESD-Pendleton including Umatilla, Morrow, Baker, Union, Malheur, Grant, and Wallowa
- June 4 ~ 9-11:30: High Desert ESD-Redmond including Jefferson, Crook, Deschutes, Harney, Gilliam, Wheeler, and Sherman
- September 25 ~ 1-3:30: NW Regional ESD-Hillsboro including Clatsop, Columbia, Tillamook, Washington, Marion, Polk, and Yamhill
- October 7 ~ 9-11:30: LBL ESD-Albany including Linn, Benton, Lincoln, and Lane
- October 10 ~ 9-11:30: Clackamas ESD-Clackamas including Clackamas, Multnomah, Hood River, and Wasco

On August 18, 2014 an all-day EI/ECSE SSIP small stakeholders meeting was held to analyze data and state infrastructure. Stakeholders reviewed focused data that were the results of the internal ODE data analysis. Discussions centered on the ODE data analysis, a description of the SSIP, data quality issues, the potential SIMR, and how to analyze the data. Stakeholders at this meeting and subsequent meetings represented a wide range of personnel representing agencies and programs serving children in Oregon including:

- State Head Start Collaboration Director
- Oregon Department of Education, Acting Early Learning System Director
- Oregon Health Authority, Child Health Director
- University of Oregon, Center on Human Development Director
- Local Early Learning Hub Director
- State Home Visiting Program, Public Health Nurse
- EI/ECSE Area Contractor and Local School District Student Services Director
- State Interagency Coordinating Council Chair (and Parent Representative)
- State Interagency Coordinating Council Parent Representative
- Local School District Student Services Director
- State Advisory Council on Special Education member
- Local EI/ECSE Service Provider
- Local School District Student Services Assistant Director
- Early Learning Division Quality Improvement Manager
- Oregon Department of Education, EI/ECSE Director
- Oregon Department of Education, EI/ECSE Education Specialists
- Oregon Department of Education, School Age Education Specialists

The Oregon Department of Education EI/ECSE staff meets bimonthly with the EI/ECSE contractors to discuss ongoing projects, upcoming state initiatives, and policy issues. The SSIP was presented and discussed at all (September 17, 2014; January 21, 2015; and March 18, 2015) EI/ECSE contractor meetings. Data analysis information was presented with those in attendance expressing support for the SSIP work.

The Oregon Department of Education Office of Learning/Student Services holds a general stakeholder meeting each November. Invitees include parents, representatives of school districts, EI/ECSE service providers, education service districts, higher education, charter schools, private schools, and state agencies. Members of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) and the State Advisory Council for Special Education (SACSE) also participate. The focus of the November 7, 2014 stakeholder meeting was the presentation of the ODE data analysis in the framework of the SSIP. Feedback from the participants concerning their support of the data analysis, infrastructure analysis, and the proposed SIMR for the Part C (EI/ECSE) and Part B SSIP was gathered via discussion and written poll. Thirty of the thirty one stakeholders chose to fill out the poll with 30 respondents indicating support for the SSIP process and the proposed SIMR.

A joint State Interagency Coordinating Committee and State Advisory Council for Special Education meeting took place on March 12, 2015. Stakeholders from both of these groups reviewed the final SSIP and Theory of Action for both Part C and Part B. All stakeholders expressed support for the plans.

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

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child- or family-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increase the rate of growth in infants and toddlers demonstrating positive social-emotional skills) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increase the percentage reported under child outcome B under Indicator 3 of the SPP/APR (knowledge and skills) and increase the percentage trend reported for families under Indicator 4 (helping their child develop and learn)).

The State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) for young children with disabilities, birth through age 5, is to increase the percentage of children demonstrating growth in social emotional and approaches to learning skills as measured by state assessment of EI and ECSE Child Outcomes.

Description

State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR)

3(a) Alignment

The state has a SIMR and the SIMR is aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator.

Statement

The State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) for young children with disabilities, birth through age 5, is to increase the percentage of children demonstrating growth in social emotional and approaches to learning skills as measured by state assessment of EI and ECSE Child Outcomes.

Description

The Oregon EI/ECSE program is a single system of EI and ECSE services for children with disabilities birth to kindergarten. Because of its seamless system of services, Oregon developed one State-Identified Measurable Result comprised of components from Indicator C3 (EI Child Outcomes) and B7 (ECSE Child Outcomes). Oregon's EI/ECSE SIMR is *to increase the percentage of infants, toddlers and preschoolers with disabilities demonstrating growth in social emotional and approaches to learning skills*. The SIMR is aligned with the following components of Indicator C3 and B7:

- Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:
 1. Positive social emotional skills (including social relationships);
 2. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication).

Summary Statement 1: Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A and B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

- B7: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:
 1. Positive social emotional skills (including social relationships);
 2. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy).

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A and B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Oregon's EI/ECSE SIMR also is related to three goals/objectives in ODE's Strategic Plan 1) every student enters kindergarten ready to learn, 2) all students read by third grade; and 3) special education services close achievement gaps.

3(b) Data and Infrastructure Analyses

The SIMR is clearly based on the data and state infrastructure analyses.

ODE selected the SIMR after a rigorous examination of statewide data and stakeholder objectives. The data and infrastructure analyses incorporated the ODE Strategic Plan and statewide initiatives. It supports ongoing efforts of ODE and early childhood education partners to improve outcomes for children ages birth to five years old.

Oregon uses the Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System (AEPS) for reporting EI and ECSE child outcomes to the federal Office of Special Education Programs. The area of "acquisition and use of knowledge and skills" as summarized on the AEPS includes a sub-set of skills often referred to as "approaches to learning." These skills include object permanence, causality, problem solving, sequencing and recalling events. Research indicates that the development of social-emotional and approaches to learning skills in early childhood education is associated with improved kindergarten readiness and academic performance in third grade (McClelland, Acock, & Morrison, 2006).

Oregon Kindergarten Assessment 2013 data show that at kindergarten entry, children with disabilities achieved lower scores, as compared to the state average, on the approaches to learning segment of the kindergarten assessment.

Oregon Kindergarten Assessment

Approaches to Learning

Early Mathematics Early Literacy

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

2013	Self Regulation	Interpersonal Skills	Total	Numbers & Operations		Letter Names		Letter Sounds		
Sub-Group	Ave. Rating (1-5)	Ave. Rating (1-5)	Ave. Rating (1-5)	Ave. Num Correct (0-16)	Ave. Num Correct (0-100)	Ave. Num Correct (0-100)	Ave. Num Correct (0-110)			
			N	N	N	N	N			
<i>State</i>	3.5	3.9	3.6	41,333	8.0	40,679	18.5	40,729	6.7	40,358
<i>Asian</i>	3.8	4.1	3.9	1394	9.4	1386	29.9	1399	12.3	1395
<i>Black</i>	3.3	3.7	3.5	984	7.2	959	19.1	977	6.2	971
<i>Hispanic</i>	3.4	3.9	3.6	10,056	6.8	9606	9.8	9513	2.9	9341
<i>American Indian</i>	3.3	3.8	3.5	561	7.2	542	14.5	550	4.7	547
<i>Pacific Islander</i>	3.4	3.8	3.5	322	7.0	311	14.7	315	4.2	311
<i>Multi-ethnic</i>	3.6	3.9	3.7	2304	8.4	2285	21.3	2306	7.9	2295
<i>White</i>	3.6	3.9	3.7	25,713	8.4	25,590	20.9	25,669	7.8	25,498
<i>Female</i>	3.7	4.1	3.8	20,155	8.0	19,847	19.2	19,873	7.1	19,692
<i>Male</i>	3.3	3.7	3.5	21,179	8.0	20,832	17.8	20,856	6.4	20,666
<i>Economically Disadvantaged</i>	3.4	3.8	3.5	22,259	7.3	21,567	13.4	21,575	4.0	21,297
<i>Limited English Proficient</i>	3.4	3.9	3.6	7823	6.5	7325	7.3	7317	1.8	7184
<i>Students with Disabilities</i>	2.9	3.4	3.1	3991	6.9	3722	12.1	3831	3.3	3788

Data Source: "Look Back" report issued by ODE in December 2014

The selected EI/ECSE SIMR provides a foundation to support the school age Part B SIMR (B17) of increasing the percentage of third grade students with disabilities reading at grade level. ODE used the following process to determine that a SIMR based on EI/ECSE child outcomes would be significant:

- Internal Indicator Data Analysis, January through June 2014
- Literature review of research data, June through August 2014
- Internal Infrastructure Analysis, June and July 2014
- Internal development of a proposed SIMR including identification of child outcomes, June through August 2014
- Small stakeholder meeting review and analysis of data, infrastructure and the proposed SIMR, August 2014.

Infrastructure Analysis revealed closely aligned early childhood education goals between ODE and stakeholders that support readiness for kindergarten and reading success by third grade.

3(c) Child-family-level

The SIMR is a child-family-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome.

The SIMR is focused on increasing the percentage of young children with disabilities demonstrating growth in social emotional and approaches to learning skills. The SIMR will be measured by the child outcome data collected in indicators C3 and B7. Research into the use of evidence-based practices to increase approaches to learning and social emotional learning skills with preschoolers indicate the skills can be effectively taught and increased (Diamond & Lee, 2011, Diamond, Barnett, Thomas, & Munro, 2007).

Implementation of coherent improvement strategies will include ODE sponsoring training in evidence-based strategies, and approval of additional evidence-based strategies in use on the local EI/ECSE program level. Pilot EI/ECSE programs will be selected based on

need, interest, and location. Statewide implementation will occur in subsequent years.

3(d) Stakeholder Involvement

On August 2014, an all-day Part C SSIP small stakeholders meeting was conducted to analyze data and infrastructure. Stakeholders at this meeting represented a wide range of programs serving children in Oregon.

Subsequent to the data and infrastructure analysis, the proposed SIMR was presented to and discussed by the stakeholders. From the discussion, a strong consensus was reached in support of the proposed SIMR. Strong support for the SIMR was also reached at the SPR & I trainings, contractor meeting, SICC meetings, and the November 7, 2014 large stakeholders meeting.

3(e) Baseline and targets

The FFY 2013 Child Outcome baseline and targets for Outcomes A and B, Summary Statement 1 serve as SIMR baseline data and targets. ODE proposes to revise the baseline and targets based on the FFY 2014 data from the revised Child Outcome data system. The new baseline and target will represent a new “Approaches to Learning component” of child outcome data, derived from the administration of the AEPS, using data from the AEPS social emotional and cognitive domains of the assessment.

Diamond, A., Barnett, W., Thomas, J., & Munro, S. (2007). Preschool program improves cognitive control. *Science*, 318 (5855), 1387-1388.

Diamond, A. & Lee, K. (2011). Interventions shown to aid executive function development in children 4-12 years old. *Science* 333(6045), 959-964.

McClelland, M., Acock, A., & Morrison, F. (2006). The impact of kindergarten learning-related skills on academic trajectories at the end of elementary school. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 21(4), 471-490.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

4(a) A description that demonstrates how the improvement strategies were selected and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). OSEP will consider the extent to which the improvement strategies are based on the data and infrastructure analysis.

The Oregon EI/ECSE program selected three evidence based coherent improvement strategies to implement based on data and the infrastructure analysis. The coherent strategies that Oregon selected are:

- Early Childhood Positive Behavior Supports and Intervention
- Collaborative Problem Solving
- Second Steps

The overarching goal of Oregon's EI/ECSE program is that children will leave EI and ECSE services with improved social emotional and approaches to learning skills so they enter kindergarten ready to succeed. Research data on early childhood education and its impact on success in early elementary grades indicate that instruction in approaches to learning skills have a strong correlation to improved reading scores in third grade. Oregon is targeting these skills as a means to better prepare children with disabilities for kindergarten and subsequently improved success with reading by third grade.

Key data that was used in Coherent Improvement Strategies Selection

C3 and B7 – Oregon Child Outcomes

The following data table shows the performance of Oregon children with IFSPs compared to most current national data. Oregon infants and toddlers with disabilities showed higher skill levels than the national mean in social-emotional skills but lower skill levels in acquisition and use of knowledge and skills. Oregon preschoolers with disabilities showed lower skill levels than the national mean in both social-emotional and acquisition and use of knowledge and skills. The mean scores in the area of acquisition and use of knowledge and skills is considerably lower than the national mean for Oregon children.

The area of acquisition and use of knowledge and skills as summarized on the AEPS (the assessment used by Oregon for reporting child outcome data to OSEP) includes a sub-set of skills often referred to as approaches to learning. The skills include object permanence, causality, problem solving, sequencing and recalling events. Current research indicates that approaches to learning skills have a strong correlation to improved reading scores at third grade. The lower skill levels in Oregon, as compared to national data, show lower than average approaches to learning skills.

C3 and B7: Oregon Child Outcomes

Of those children who entered or exited EI or ECSE below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they “aged out” (turned age three or six) of the program or exited the program

Summary Statement 1	Early Intervention		Early Childhood Special Education	
	Oregon	National	Oregon	National
Positive Social Emotional Skills	82.7%	65.0%	75.1%	81.0%
Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	55.5%	70.0%	61.2%	80.0%

Data Source: Oregon Data: FFY 2013 APR (2013 data). National Data: Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report 2013 Indicator Analyses (2012 data). Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report 2013 Indicator Analyses (2012 data).

2013-14 Kindergarten Assessment

The Kindergarten Assessment data show that children with disabilities scored noticeably lower than the state average in all domains except for letter naming. The discrepancy in scores for students with disabilities in the “Approaches to Learning” domain emphasizes the need for Oregon EI/ECSE programs to focus on social emotional skills and approaches to learning skills. This focus may increase the approaches to learning skills of these children and, in turn, improve their kindergarten readiness and early literacy skills in the primary grades.

Oregon Kindergarten Assessment

2013	Approaches to Learning			Early Mathematics		Early Literacy				
	Self Regulation	Interpersonal Skills	Total	Numbers & Operations	Letter Names	Letter Sounds				
Sub-Group	Ave. Rating (1-5)	Ave. Rating (1-5)	Ave. Rating (1-5)	Ave. Num Correct (0-16)	Ave. Num Correct (0-100)	Ave. Num Correct (0-110)	N	N	N	
<i>State</i>	3.5	3.9	3.6	41,333	8.0	40,679	18.5	40,729	6.7	40,358
<i>Asian</i>	3.8	4.1	3.9	1394	9.4	1386	29.9	1399	12.3	1395
<i>Black</i>	3.3	3.7	3.5	984	7.2	959	19.1	977	6.2	971
<i>Hispanic</i>	3.4	3.9	3.6	10,056	6.8	9606	9.8	9513	2.9	9341
<i>American Indian</i>	3.3	3.8	3.5	561	7.2	542	14.5	550	4.7	547
<i>Pacific Islander</i>	3.4	3.8	3.5	322	7.0	311	14.7	315	4.2	311
<i>Multi-ethnic</i>	3.6	3.9	3.7	2304	8.4	2285	21.3	2306	7.9	2295
<i>White</i>	3.6	3.9	3.7	25,713	8.4	25,590	20.9	25,669	7.8	25,498
<i>Female</i>	3.7	4.1	3.8	20,155	8.0	19,847	19.2	19,873	7.1	19,692
<i>Male</i>	3.3	3.7	3.5	21,179	8.0	20,832	17.8	20,856	6.4	20,666
<i>Economically Disadvantaged</i>	3.4	3.8	3.5	22,259	7.3	21,567	13.4	21,575	4.0	21,297

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

Limited

English Proficient	3.4	3.9	3.6	7823	6.5	7325	7.3	7317	1.8	7184
--------------------	-----	-----	-----	------	-----	------	-----	------	-----	------

Students with Disabilities	2.9	3.4	3.1	3991	6.9	3722	12.1	3831	3.3	3788
----------------------------	-----	-----	-----	------	-----	------	------	------	-----	------

Data Source: "Look Back" report issued by ODE in December 2014

The selected EI/ECSE SIMR provides a foundation to support the school age Part B SIMR (B17) of increasing the percentage of third grade students with disabilities reading at grade level. ODE used the following process to determine that a SIMR based on EI/ECSE child outcomes would be significant:

- Internal Indicator Data Analysis, January through June 2014
- Literature review of research data, June through August 2014
- Internal Infrastructure Analysis, June and July 2014
- Internal development of a proposed SIMR including identification of child outcomes, June through August 2014
- Small stakeholder meeting review and analysis of data, infrastructure and the proposed SIMR, August 2014.

Infrastructure Analysis revealed closely aligned early childhood education goals between ODE and stakeholders that support readiness for kindergarten and reading success by third grade.

3(c) Child-family-level

The SIMR is a child-family-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome.

The SIMR is focused on increasing the percentage of young children with disabilities demonstrating growth in social emotional and approaches to learning skills. The SIMR will be measured by the child outcome data collected in indicators C3 and B7. Research into the use of evidence-based practices to increase approaches to learning and social emotional learning skills with preschoolers indicate the skills can be effectively taught and increased (Diamond & Lee, 2011, Diamond, Barnett, Thomas, & Munro, 2007).

Implementation of coherent improvement strategies will include ODE sponsoring training in evidence-based strategies, and approval of additional evidence-based strategies in use on the local EI/ECSE program level. Pilot EI/ECSE programs will be selected based on need, interest, and location. Statewide implementation will occur in subsequent years.

3(d) Stakeholder Involvement

On August 2014, an all-day Part C SSIP small stakeholders meeting was conducted to analyze data and infrastructure. Stakeholders at this meeting represented a wide range of programs serving children in Oregon.

Subsequent to the data and infrastructure analysis, the proposed SIMR was presented to and discussed by the stakeholders. From the discussion, a strong consensus was reached in support of the proposed SIMR. Strong support for the SIMR was also reached at the SPR & I trainings, contractor meeting, SICCC meetings, and the November 7, 2014 large stakeholders meeting.

3(e) Baseline and targets

The FFY 2013 Child Outcome baseline and targets for Outcomes A and B, Summary Statement 1 serve as SIMR baseline data and targets. ODE proposes to revise the baseline and targets based on the FFY 2014 data from the revised Child Outcome data system. The new baseline and target will represent a new "Approaches to Learning component" of child outcome data, derived from the administration of the AEPS, using data from the AEPS social emotional and cognitive domains of the assessment.

Diamond, A., Barnett, W., Thomas, J., & Munro, S. (2007). Preschool program improves cognitive control. *Science*, 318 (5855), 1387-1388.

Diamond, A. & Lee, K. (2011). Interventions shown to aid executive function development in children 4-12 years old. *Science* 333(6045), 959-964.

McClelland, M., Acock, A., & Morrison, F. (2006). The impact of kindergarten learning-related skills on academic trajectories at the end of elementary school. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 21(4), 471-490.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

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

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

4(a) A description that demonstrates how the improvement strategies were selected and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). OSEP will consider the extent to which the improvement strategies are based on the data and infrastructure analysis.

The Oregon EI/ECSE program selected three evidence based coherent improvement strategies to implement based on data and the infrastructure analysis. The coherent strategies that Oregon selected are:

- Early Childhood Positive Behavior Supports and Intervention
- Collaborative Problem Solving
- Second Steps

The overarching goal of Oregon's EI/ECSE program is that children will leave EI and ECSE services with improved social emotional and approaches to learning skills so they enter kindergarten ready to succeed. Research data on early childhood education and its impact on success in early elementary grades indicate that instruction in approaches to learning skills have a strong correlation to improved reading scores in third grade. Oregon is targeting these skills as a means to better prepare children with disabilities for kindergarten and subsequently improved success with reading by third grade.

Key data that was used in Coherent Improvement Strategies Selection

C3 and B7 – Oregon Child Outcomes

The following data table shows the performance of Oregon children with IFSPs compared to most current national data. Oregon infants and toddlers with disabilities showed higher skill levels than the national mean in social-emotional skills but lower skill levels in acquisition and use of knowledge and skills. Oregon preschoolers with disabilities showed lower skill levels than the national mean in both social-emotional and acquisition and use of knowledge and skills. The mean scores in the area of acquisition and use of knowledge and skills is considerably lower than the national mean for Oregon children.

The area of acquisition and use of knowledge and skills as summarized on the AEPS (the assessment used by Oregon for reporting child outcome data to OSEP) includes a sub-set of skills often referred to as approaches to learning. The skills include object permanence, causality, problem solving, sequencing and recalling events. Current research indicates that approaches to learning skills have a strong correlation to improved reading scores at third grade. The lower skill levels in Oregon, as compared to national data, show lower than average approaches to learning skills.

C3 and B7: Oregon Child Outcomes

Of those children who entered or exited EI or ECSE below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they “aged out” (turned age three or six) of the program or exited the program

	Early Intervention		Early Childhood Special Education	
	Oregon	National	Oregon	National
Summary Statement 1				
Positive Social Emotional Skills	82.7%	65.0%	75.1%	81.0%
Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	55.5%	70.0%	61.2%	80.0%

Data Source: Oregon Data: FFY 2013 APR (2013 data). National Data: Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report 2013 Indicator Analyses (2012 data). Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report 2013 Indicator Analyses (2012 data).

2013-14 Kindergarten Assessment

The Kindergarten Assessment data show that children with disabilities scored noticeably lower than the state average in all domains except for letter naming. The discrepancy in scores for students with disabilities in the “Approaches to Learning” domain emphasizes the need for Oregon EI/ECSE programs to focus on social emotional skills and approaches to learning skills. This focus may increase the approaches to learning skills of these children and, in turn, improve their kindergarten readiness and early literacy skills in the primary grades.

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Oregon Kindergarten Assessment**

Approaches to Learning				Early Mathematics		Early Literacy				
2013	Self Regulation	Interpersonal Skills	Total	Numbers & Operations		Letter Names		Letter Sounds		
	Ave. Rating (1-5)	Ave. Rating (1-5)	Ave. Rating (1-5)	Ave. Num Correct (0-16)	Ave. Num Correct (0-100)	Ave. Num Correct (0-100)	Ave. Num Correct (0-110)	N	N	
<i>State</i>	3.5	3.9	3.6	41,333	38.0	40,679	18.5	40,729	6.7	40,358
<i>Asian</i>	3.8	4.1	3.9	1394	9.4	1386	29.9	1399	12.3	1395
<i>Black</i>	3.3	3.7	3.5	984	7.2	959	19.1	977	6.2	971
<i>Hispanic</i>	3.4	3.9	3.6	10,056	6.8	9606	9.8	9513	2.9	9341
<i>American Indian</i>	3.3	3.8	3.5	561	7.2	542	14.5	550	4.7	547
<i>Pacific Islander</i>	3.4	3.8	3.5	322	7.0	311	14.7	315	4.2	311
<i>Multi-ethnic</i>	3.6	3.9	3.7	2304	8.4	2285	21.3	2306	7.9	2295
<i>White</i>	3.6	3.9	3.7	25,713	8.4	25,590	20.9	25,669	7.8	25,498
<i>Female</i>	3.7	4.1	3.8	20,155	8.0	19,847	19.2	19,873	7.1	19,692
<i>Male</i>	3.3	3.7	3.5	21,179	8.0	20,832	17.8	20,856	6.4	20,666
<i>Economically Disadvantaged</i>	3.4	3.8	3.5	22,259	7.3	21,567	13.4	21,575	4.0	21,297
<i>Limited English Proficient</i>	3.4	3.9	3.6	7823	6.5	7325	7.3	7317	1.8	7184
<i>Students with Disabilities</i>	2.9	3.4	3.1	3991	6.9	3722	12.1	3831	3.3	3788

Data Source: "Look Back" report issued by ODE in December 2014

Third Grade Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (OAKS)

These data show a three year downward trend for students with disabilities. On the 2013 statewide assessment for reading, 66% of all third grade students met or exceeded the state target. In that same year, only 32% of children with disabilities met or exceeded the target – a gap of 34 percentage points. While data for all students show a downward trajectory over the last three years, the data for students with disabilities are considerably lower than all subgroups.

Third Grade Reading Assessment: Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding State Benchmark

2011-2013	2011	2012	2013
All Students	70%	66%	66%
Students with Disabilities	36%	33%	32%

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

American Indian/Alaskan Native	58%	55%	54%
Asian/Pacific Islander	78%	74%	72%
Black	53%	50%	48%
Hispanic	50%	45%	45%
White	77%	74%	74%
Multi-Racial	76%	72%	71%
Asian	(no data)	78%	76%

Data Source: FFY 2011-2013 Statewide Assessment Performance Data by Race/Ethnicity and Disability

Key Components of Infrastructure Analysis

The infrastructure analysis was instrumental in selecting the coherent improvement strategies. Specific key components that led to the coherent strategies are:

- ODE's Strategic Plan:
 - Goal 1.1 Integrate early learning programs across the relevant state agencies so every student enters kindergarten ready to learn.
 - Goal 1.2 Implement statewide literacy programs so all students read by third grade.
 - Goal 1.5 Improve quality of special education services to close achievement gaps.
- Goals of Stakeholder Partners: Early Learning System programs have the same goals for children and families related to strengthening kindergarten readiness and in turn improving the third grade benchmark for literacy. A core initiative of the Early Learning Division is early literacy and kindergarten readiness. A goal of the Home Visiting programs is improved school readiness and achievement. Kindergarten readiness is also a goal of Coordinated Care Organizations within the Oregon Health Authority.
- Fiscal: The Oregon Legislature has supported these goals by financing initiatives focusing specifically on early learning, early literacy and reading skills.
- Professional Development: Technical assistance from the University of Oregon through the ECPC project has revitalized professional development to EI/ECSE practitioners in Oregon. The work refocused support to programs through intensive training (e.g., summer institute) on teaching social emotional and approaches to learning skills.
- State Initiatives: The proposed 2015-17 legislation for Evidence-Based Systems Implementation and Age Three to Grade Three Literacy Initiative.

4(b) A description that demonstrates how the improvement strategies are sound, logical and aligned. OSEP will consider the extent to which:

- **The strategies are sound, logical and aligned with the SIMR and lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s).**
- **Current state initiatives were considered in developing the improvement strategies.**

The improvement strategies are evidence-based and currently are implemented in pockets around the state. In the coming years, ODE will offer training and financial support to programs that commit to implementing specific strategies to fidelity. Each coherent strategy is evidence based, sound, logical and aligned with the SIMR and will lead to measurable improvement.

Coherent Strategy: Oregon Early Childhood Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (EC PBIS)

Since 2005, the Oregon Department of Education has embraced the tiered intervention model developed by the Center for Social Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (CSEFEL) and the Technical Assistance Center on Social Emotional Intervention for young children (TACSEI). This evidence-based model is also known as the "Pyramid Model" for early childhood positive behavior instructional support (EC PBIS).

The Pyramid model promotes levels of intervention, beginning with a foundation of leadership and staff training designed to develop an effective workforce in early childhood programs. The next two levels include strategies for all children in early learning environments (including children with IFSPs), sometimes referred to as "universal strategies." These strategies include environmental design, building positive relationships between children and adults, the use of positive engagement by adults, positive environments, and consistent rules.

The next level of the Pyramid is targeted at children who demonstrate difficulties with social interactions with others. The focus of this level is targeted social emotional supports through the use of teaching and embedding social skills in everyday routines, using evidence-based social emotional teaching strategies.

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

Finally, the small area on the top of the pyramid uses targeted individualized intensive interventions for children whose social skills and behavior need further intervention beyond learning social skills, such as behavior support plans with individualized strategies.

During the last ten years, ODE and its EI/ECSE contractors have supported a group of professional staff from EI/ECSE programs who meet periodically to discuss and refine the implementation of EC PBIS in early childhood programs in Oregon, notably those where children enrolled in ECSE attend preschool. Most of these settings are Head Start, Oregon Prekindergarten classrooms and ECSE classrooms. The staff train, track, and implement PBIS with fidelity as their primary goal. They meet several times per year, and continue to refine implementation of EC PBIS in Oregon. They have honed their approach by adding evidence-based coaching techniques, as well as improved data collection and analysis.

As a part of the SSIP, ODE will continue working with EI/ECSE programs using EC PBIS but will require programs requesting state funding and training to purposefully teach social emotional and approaches to learning skills to all children in the program as part of the first level (effective workforce) of the EC PBIS model.

Coherent Strategy: Collaborative Problem Solving

The Collaborative Problem Solving (CPS) strategy is used in Think:Kids, a program of Massachusetts General Hospital that has proven to be effective with children with social, emotional, and behavioral challenges. The Think:Kids partner program in Oregon is housed at Oregon Health and Science University. CPS is an evidence-based model utilizing a neurobiologically-grounded approach with children and families.

The model teaches social emotional skills and approaches to learning skills through a collaborative process in increments that the child can handle developmentally. This collaborative process helps teachers pursue expectations, reduce challenging behavior, teach skills and gather information with an empathetic rather than punitive stance. This encourages resilience and success in the face of challenges. (Oregon Health Sciences University, 2015)

Currently, CPS is in the third year of implementation by one of the EI/ECSE contractors in one program. During the past three years, the program established pilot classrooms and provided training to staff and parents in the implementation of CPS strategies. Pilot classrooms are supported via weekly consultation. In the third year of implementation, dedicated weekly CPS time in all ECSE classrooms is supported by outside consultants. The program is implementing CPS in conjunction with EC PBIS strategies which makes it more amenable to other EI/ECSE programs already using PBIS strategies. The following is a chart illustrating how the strategies complement one another.

EC PBIS	Complimenting	CPS
PBIS is a framework to positively work with all children.	A framework in which to think of all children as doing as well as they can and what supports and skills do they need to increase.	CPS has the philosophy "People do well if they can."
Pre-teaches and supports expectations		
Supports the staff in clearly defining rules and expectations across settings for preschoolers and adults.	Supports child's growth through identifying adult expectations and child's lagging skills.	Identifies skills that are lagging or not yet developed and looks to teach those skills.
Encourages positive behavior.	Encouraging positive behavior by both examining predictable problem behaviors and encouraging pre-teaching.	Thoughtful and pro-active approach toward predictable problem behaviors.
Promotes social/emotional development and pro-social skills.		
Works for all students.		
Uses targeted interventions to teach skills to children not responding to group wide instruction.	Works for all children but can modified to support and promote growth in specific lagging skills.	Philosophy is aimed at all kids, but plan b's are likely to be necessary for yellow and red zone children.
Values positive over negative interactions.	Both promote personalized relationships through empathy, encouragements and availability.	Focuses on the relationship development between children and adults
Focuses on specific encouragements.		CPS prioritizes empathy in the adult to support problem solving skill development in children and their relationships.

Source: Willamette Education Service District, October 2014, COSA presentation

Coherent Strategy: Second Step

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

Second Step is an early learning program that teaches young children social-emotional and self-regulations skills. It is designed to increase social competence and reduce impulsive and aggressive behavior. It addresses skills for learning, empathy, emotion management, problem solving, friendships, and transitioning to kindergarten. Weekly themes with short (five to seven minutes) activities incorporate a variety of learning strategies such as, stories, puppets, small group practice, songs, Brain Builder games, and visual aids. (Committee for Children: Second Step, 2015).

One EI/ECSE program in Oregon is using this program and another is planning to adopt it within the next year.

Relationship of Coherent Strategies to Current State Initiatives

The coherent strategies selected by Oregon are related to the Oregon Literacy grants, Kindergarten Readiness Partnership and Innovation grants, P-3 Alignment and the newly proposed Age Three to Grade Three Initiative in that all of these strategies focus on children prepared to succeed in kindergarten and reading by third grade. The Age Three to Grade Three Literacy Initiative holds exceptional promise as it will, if approved by the State Legislature, combine early childhood and school age strategies by sharing professional development, aligning academic and social emotional standards, and working on the transition from the early years to the early grades, which will make a difference for all children in Oregon, including children with disabilities.

Last year, Oregon had 68% of its students reading by third grade, with 32% of students not meeting the reading standard. Most of the students who were not successful were students of color, living in poverty or had disabilities. This indicates that students are not being identified early enough and needing more strategic intervention or support, or are referred for special education services, which may not be appropriate. This comprehensive initiative is needed to significantly change the trajectory of students as they move toward successful graduation and to reach Oregon's goal of 40-40-20. The Age Three to Grade Three Literacy Initiative will support and enhance regional and local efforts to connect, integrate, and align early learning and K-12 systems, and help to prevent the opportunity and achievement gaps.

4(c) A description of how implementation of improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build capacity to achieve the SIMR for children with disabilities.

Identified root causes for low performance in children with disabilities in the areas of social emotional^[1] and approaches to learning (sub-group of acquisition of knowledge and skills) skills in both EI and ECSE Child Outcomes and the Kindergarten Assessment are attributed to inconsistency in purposefully teaching these skills. While ODE has supported EI/ECSE programs implementing EC PBIS strategies, Tier One and Tier Two are focused on effective workforce and use of "universal strategies" with all children. Not until Tier Three are social emotional teaching strategies are specifically used to teach children. In addition, ODE has not focused on implementing any of the proposed coherent strategies state-wide with fidelity.

ODE's school age program has experience with Implementation Science Principles in scaling up multi-tiered systems of support for students in school districts and schools. ODE's EI/ECSE program plans to tap this experience in scaling up coherent strategies described in this section of the SSIP.

4(d) A description of how the selection of coherent improvement strategies include the strategies, identified through the data and State infrastructure analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support providers implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State Identified measurable result(s) for children and their families. OSEP will consider:

- **The extent to which the improvement strategies will address the areas of need identified within and across systems at multiple levels (e.g., State, programs, providers, and families) and build the capacity of the State providers and families to improve the SIMR.**
- **The adequacy of the plan to implement and scale up the improvement strategies.**

ODE is sponsoring several intensive training opportunities in a June 2015 summer institute. One of the courses at the summer institute will be five-day session on one of Oregon's coherent strategies, Collaborative Problem Solving. Participants in this course will come from ODE selected implementation sites including at least one person designated as the coach for each site. Implementation sites will include home-based, ECSE classroom-based and community classroom-based programs. All participants will become Level 1 CPS trainers and will be expected to implement CPS strategies to fidelity at their sites.

Selected sites are expected to:

- Implement CPS in selected implementation sites;
- Participate in Level 1 training at summer institute in 2015;
- Participate in Level 2 training at summer institute in 2016;
- Add sites in the second year;
- Assign a coach to work with implementation site teams;
- Attend (coach) at least four Professional Learning Team (PLTs) focused on CPS) during 2015-16;
- Collect and report child level data to ODE; and
- Provide periodic evidence to ODE that they are implementing CPS with fidelity.

ODE will support selected sites by:

- Providing coaching FTE to each EI/ECSE program participating with selected implementation sites;

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

- Sponsoring training (Level 1 and 2) for implementation site coaches and teams; and
- Sponsoring Professional Learning Teams each year.

EI/ECSE programs implementing the other two coherent strategies (EC PBIS and Second Steps) will be required to meet specific criteria to obtain additional supports (coaching FTE) from ODE. These include:

- Providing administrative commitment to implementing the strategy;
- Purposefully teaching social emotional and approaches to learning skills to children and families in their program(s);
- Providing periodic evidence to ODE that they are implementing the strategy with fidelity;
- Collecting and reporting child level data to ODE; and
- Committing to scaling up the strategy in their programs.

4(e) A description of stakeholder involvement in the selection of coherent improvement strategies, OSEP will consider the extent to which:

- **Multiple internal and external stakeholders were engaged in identifying improvement activities.**

Oregon is very proud of the involvement of many individuals and groups in the development of Phase I of its State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Stakeholders are invested in the outcome of the State Initiated Measurable Result and have requested continued involvement with Phase II. Their contribution has been invaluable with all components, including data analysis, infrastructure analysis, determination of the SIMR and appropriate coherent strategies. Stakeholders are particularly supportive of the coherent strategies ODE selected for improving social emotional and approaches to learning skills for children with disabilities. The following is a list of representatives who participated in Phase I of the SSIP for the past 16 months:

- Oregon Department of Education
- Early Learning Division: State Head Start Collaboration, Acting Early Learning System Director, Child Care Office, Quality Improvement Office
- Oregon Health Authority
- University of Oregon, Center on Human Development
- Local Early Learning Hubs
- State Home Visiting Programs
- Head Start
- Oregon Prekindergarten
- Migrant/Seasonal Head Start
- EI/ECSE Area Contractors
- EI/ECSE Service Providers: Teachers and Administrators
- State Interagency Coordinating Council
- Parents of Children with Disabilities
- Local School Districts: Teachers and Administrators
- State Advisory Council on Special Education
- Oregon Council on Developmental Disabilities
- Education Service Districts: Teachers and Administrators
- Department of Human Services: Office of Developmental Disabilities

The Oregon Department of Education EI/ECSE staff meets bimonthly with the EI/ECSE contractors to discuss ongoing projects, upcoming state initiatives, and policy issues. The SSIP was presented and discussed at all (September 17, 2014; January 21, 2015; and March 18, 2015) EI/ECSE contractor meetings. Ideas for coherent strategies to improve social emotional and approaches to learning skills were discussed, with those in attendance expressing their support for selected strategies and the SSIP work.

A joint State Interagency Coordinating Committee and State Advisory Council for Special Education meeting took place on March 12, 2015. Stakeholders from both of these groups reviewed the final SSIP and selected coherent strategies for both Part C and Part B. All stakeholders expressed support for the plans.

References

Committee for Children (2015). *Second Step*. Retrieved March 25, 2015 from <http://www.cfchildren.org/second-step>.

Oregon Health Sciences University (2015). *Collaborative Problem Solving*. Retrieved March 25, 2015 from: <http://www.ohsu.edu/xd/education/schools/school-of-medicine/departments/clinical-departments/psychiatry/divisions-and-clinics/child-and-adolescent-psychiatry/CPS/index.cfm>.

Think Kids: Rethinking Challenging Kids (2015). *Our Collaborative Problem Solving Approach*. Retrieved March 25, 2015 from: <http://thinkkids.org/learn/our-collaborative-problem-solving-approach/>.

Theory of Action

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

[Theory of Action Part C](#) Theory of Action Part C

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

5(b) A description of how the graphic illustration shows the rationale of how implementing a coherent set of improvement strategies will lead to the achievement of improved results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

The first arrow of Oregon's Theory of Action illustrates the supports that the Oregon Department of Education will provide EI/ECSE programs to facilitate the implementation of evidence-based strategies targeting social-emotional and approaches to learning skills. Technical assistance will include intensive training opportunities in selected strategies, the use of ongoing professional learning teams, and the support of trained coaches to assist in the implementation of strategies with fidelity.

The second arrow of the graphic illustrates EI/ECSE programs selecting and implementing specific strategies for teaching social-emotional and approaches to learning skills. Ongoing training and coaching support will be needed to ensure programs will implement strategies with fidelity.

The third arrow indicates if programs receive the needed supports and implement those supports with fidelity, children who receive EI and ECSE services will demonstrate greater growth in social-emotional and approaches to learning skills. What is not illustrated in the graphic is the premise that children with elevated social-emotional and approaches to learning skills will exhibit improved results in literacy and reading skills in the upper elementary grades, middle school, and high school as well. Improving social-emotional and approaches to learning outcomes in young children with disabilities will have life-long educational benefits.

5(c) The State describes involvement of multiple and external stakeholders in the development of the Theory of Action.

As described in the SSIP sections on Data Analysis, Infrastructure Analysis, State Identified Measurable Result, a draft Theory of Action was shared with internal and external stakeholders in meetings starting in the fall of 2013 through March 2015. Highlights of the schedule of these meetings include:

- Large stakeholder meeting, November 7, 2013
- SICC meeting, November 22, 2013
- Regional meetings conducted by the Associate Superintendent, Office of Learning, Student Services, May 16, May 30, June 4, September 25, and October 7, 2014
- Part C SSIP small stakeholders meeting, August 18, 2014
- EI/ECSE contractors meetings, September 2014, and January 2015
- Regional SPR & I trainings, October 2014.
- Large stakeholder meeting, November 7, 2014

From stakeholder feedback gathered at these meetings, an internal stakeholder group at ODE further refined the Theory of Action in March 2015. This final draft of the Theory of Action was presented to the joint SICC/SACSE meeting on March 12, 2015 and the EI/ECSE contractors meeting on March 18, 2015 for additional feedback.

Infrastructure Development

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

Oregon's Phase II SSIP is included as an attachment.

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

(a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

(b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.

(c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Oregon's Phase II SSIP is included as an attachment.

Evaluation

(a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

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

(c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).

(d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Oregon's Phase II SSIP is included as an attachment.

Technical Assistance and Support

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

Oregon's Phase II SSIP is included as an attachment.

Phase III submissions should include:

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

A. Summary of Phase 3

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

Oregon's 2018 Phase III (2) SSIP is included as an attachment.

B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

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

Oregon's 2018 Phase III (2) SSIP is included as an attachment.

C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

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

Oregon's 2018 Phase III (2) SSIP is included as an attachment.

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

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

Oregon's 2018 Phase III (2) SSIP is included as an attachment.

E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SiMR, sustainability, and scale-up

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

- 2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
- 3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SIMR
- 4. Measurable improvements in the SIMR in relation to targets

Oregon's 2018 Phase III (2) SSIP is included as an attachment.

F. Plans for Next Year

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

Oregon's 2018 Phase III (2) SSIP is included as an attachment.

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

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

Selected: Lead Agency Director

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

Name: Sarah Drinkwater, Ph.D.

Title: Assistant Superintendent

Email: sarah.drinkwater@ode.state.or.us

Phone: 503-947-5702