

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

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

**For reporting on
FFY18**

Oregon



PART C DUE February 3, 2020

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

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) Office of Enhancing Student Opportunities 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.

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 Enhancing Student Opportunities 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 34 CFR 303.700-708 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 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.

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 training on an "as needed" basis that addresses data collection, and compliance and performance issues, as part of the SPR&I continuous improvement mechanism.

The ODE website (Contractor Webpage) provides up-to-date forms, program operation guidelines, and information for parents and EI/ECSE contractors.

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.

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, Oregon State University, Early Learning and Wellness, 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.

Stakeholder Involvement:

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

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.

On November 6, 2018, over 60 stakeholders participated in review of and submitted recommendations for Indicators B4A, B4B, and B17 as well as for the School Age and EI/ECSE Special Education Report Cards redesign. 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.

In Fall 2019, stakeholders comprised of all EI/ECSE contractors, subcontractors, and program coordinators participated in target setting for the FFY 2019 Annual Performance Report (APR).

Reporting to the Public:

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

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, 2018. 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, and in our April 2020 release fully accessible by the visually impaired. The site to access report cards online is included as an attachment to the introduction.

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 online. The site to access the APR online is included as an attachment to the introduction.

Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

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

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

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	99.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	96.00%	90.91%	85.62%	92.31%	92.86%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
147	156	92.86%	100%	95.51%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

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

Include your State’s criteria for “timely” receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

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

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 34 CFR 303.700-708 are met. Data are based on actual number of days. 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 2018, Oregon was at 95.51% in providing early intervention services in a timely manner. This is a 3.20 percentage point increase from FFY 2017.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
11	11	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

ODE verified that 100% (11/11) of incidents of noncompliance in FFY 2017 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 §§ 303.340, 303.342, 303.344(f)(1) through subsequent file reviews submitted in SPR&I.

The following steps were completed for the verification process for each individual noncompliance:

- The EI program provided the reason for each individual noncompliance through online submission into SPR&I, Oregon’s monitoring system and
- ODE reviewed the reason for noncompliance and indicated corrective action needed and
- The EI program submitted the corrective action on the individual noncompliance in SPR&I and
- ODE reviewed the submitted corrective action and approved same.

Demonstration of correction of practices that contributed to the noncompliance as well as current compliance with 34 CFR §§ 303.340, 303.342, 303.344(f)(1) was obtained through the following:

- EI programs with noncompliance completed additional reviews of files that were developed after the original noncompliance in the area of the identified noncompliance.

At this stage, if any additional file reviewed was noncompliant, a systemic correction was completed. Systemic corrections were also completed for any noncompliance where one third of the reviewed files submitted were noncompliant in the same monitoring standard.

- EI programs with systemic noncompliance developed and implemented interventions to address the specific noncompliance. After completion of intervention(s), the EI program reviewed additional files that were developed after the intervention(s) in the area of noncompliance. ODE reviewed interventions and additional file reviews to confirm regulatory compliance.

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

ODE verified that 100% (11/11) of incidents of noncompliance in FFY 2017 were corrected within one year through data submission in SPR&I, the state online monitoring system:

- Nine programs had one incident of noncompliance each
- One program had two incidents of noncompliance

Reasons for delay in services were as follows:

- Six instances of Related services being provided late due to staff scheduling conflicts
- Two instances of services scheduled after the start date on IFSP
- Three instances where services were delivered after the start date with no explanation.

These ten programs were required to verify through SPR&I that services were provided to these 11 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.

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	81.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target>=	80.00%	96.50%	96.50%	96.50%	96.50%
Data	96.46%	96.43%	97.54%	97.01%	98.15%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=	96.50%	96.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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.

On November 6, 2018, over 60 stakeholders participated in review of and submitted recommendations for Indicators B4A, B4B, and B17 as well as for

the School Age and EI/ECSE Special Education Report Cards redesign. 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.

In Fall 2019, stakeholders comprised of all EI/ECSE contractors, subcontractors, and program coordinators participated in target setting for the FFY 2019 Annual Performance Report (APR).

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	4,321
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	4,388

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of Infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
4,321	4,388	98.15%	96.50%	98.47%	Met Target	No Slippage

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

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

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

Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3 - Indicator Data

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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.

On November 6, 2018, over 60 stakeholders participated in review of and submitted recommendations for Indicators B4A, B4B, and B17 as well as for the School Age and EI/ECSE Special Education Report Cards redesign. 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.

In Fall 2019, stakeholders comprised of all EI/ECSE contractors, subcontractors, and program coordinators participated in target setting for the FFY 2019 Annual Performance Report (APR).

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2015	Target>=	81.40%	81.40%	82.00%	85.40%	85.40%
A1	84.89%	Data	82.72%	81.54%	84.89%	85.08%	84.83%
A2	2015	Target>=	59.40%	59.40%	60.00%	42.30%	42.30%
A2	41.00%	Data	59.59%	57.29%	41.00%	41.80%	42.11%
B1	2015	Target>=	64.20%	64.20%	64.30%	66.70%	66.70%
B1	66.42%	Data	61.24%	61.33%	66.42%	64.32%	61.85%
B2	2015	Target>=	7.60%	7.60%	8.00%	36.00%	36.00%
B2	35.69%	Data	9.22%	8.51%	35.69%	34.82%	34.39%
C1	2015	Target>=	64.90%	64.90%	65.00%	77.80%	77.80%
C1	77.28%	Data	65.97%	65.97%	77.28%	75.83%	75.75%
C2	2015	Target>=	18.40%	18.40%	18.50%	40.60%	40.60%
C2	40.33%	Data	14.73%	13.29%	40.33%	38.95%	36.61%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1>=	85.40%	85.40%
Target A2>=	42.30%	42.30%
Target B1>=	66.70%	66.70%
Target B2>=	36.00%	36.00%
Target C1>=	77.80%	77.80%
Target C2>=	40.60%	40.60%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

2,655

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	107	4.03%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	243	9.15%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,211	45.61%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	819	30.85%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	275	10.36%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,030	2,380	84.83%	85.40%	85.29%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	1,094	2,655	42.11%	42.30%	41.21%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	57	2.15%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	823	31.00%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	859	32.35%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	541	20.38%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	375	14.12%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	1,400	2,280	61.85%	66.70%	61.40%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	916	2,655	34.39%	36.00%	34.50%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	56	2.11%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	559	21.05%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,074	40.45%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	734	27.65%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	232	8.74%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	1,808	2,423	75.75%	77.80%	74.62%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	966	2,655	36.61%	40.60%	36.38%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable

Slippage in performance occurred in our medium-sized and rural Part C programs. Enrollment in Part C services for FFY 2018 increased 5.9% statewide in Oregon while funding for these services remained static. These factors may have negatively affected medium and rural programs who do not have the economies of scale of the large urban programs. Additionally, a new child outcome data entry system was instituted and through data analysis it was determined that many of the Part C programs were making data entry errors which lowered their child outcome data results.

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	3,759
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.	1,145

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

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

NO

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

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.

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

4 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2014	Target >=	86.00%	89.63%	89.73%	89.83%	90.00%
A	89.63%	Data	65.12%	89.63%	91.42%	95.24%	89.69%
B	2014	Target >=	85.00%	89.50%	89.60%	89.70%	90.00%
B	89.50%	Data	58.14%	89.50%	89.67%	92.86%	92.07%
C	2014	Target >=	90.00%	92.09%	92.19%	92.29%	92.59%
C	92.09%	Data	76.74%	92.09%	92.72%	94.60%	90.25%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	91.00%	91.00%
Target B >=	91.00%	91.00%
Target C >=	93.09%	93.09%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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.

On November 6, 2018, over 60 stakeholders participated in review of and submitted recommendations for Indicators B4A, B4B, and B17 as well as for the School Age and EI/ECSE Special Education Report Cards redesign. 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.

In Fall 2019, stakeholders comprised of all EI/ECSE contractors, subcontractors, and program coordinators participated in target setting for the FFY 2019 Annual Performance Report (APR).

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	1,551
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	186
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	175
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	186
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	170
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	186
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	168
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	186

	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2)	89.69%	91.00%	94.09%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2)	92.07%	91.00%	91.40%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2)	90.25%	93.09%	90.32%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

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

The sampling methodology is designed to choose a representative set of districts/programs each year that is reflective of the state's 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.

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

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, 44% of the population has a child who was age 2 as of December 1st, and the results indicate that 40% of the respondents had a child who was age 2 as of December 1st. Parents of white children were over-represented (the results indicate that 78% of parent respondents had a student with a race/ethnicity of white whereas 67% of children receiving Part C services are white). However, there were no significant differences in the positivity of responses on the survey itself between parents of Hispanic students and parents of other race/ethnicities so we are confident that the overall results are representative of the State. Furthermore, results were weighted by program to ensure that the parent survey results reflected the population of parents. ODE will continue to encourage parents of children of all race/ethnicities to complete the survey

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Oregon examined results by program and identified programs that had a lower rate this year than the last year they were surveyed. While all programs receive a detailed report of their survey results and are encouraged to identify areas where they might improve, ODE plans to reach out to these programs to explore what they are doing (or not doing) to encourage parent involvement. In addition, ODE plans to identify programs with a high non-white population and collect the following data to inform and support programs parent involvement survey efforts:

1. Identify current communication and dissemination strategies programs are utilizing.
2. Collect program input as to why the response rate of parents of non-white students is low.
3. Identify additional communication and/or dissemination strategies for increasing the response rate of parents--especially, parents of non-white students.
4. Ask programs if there are actions ODE and/or its survey vendor could do in terms of survey design/format/administration that would increase the likelihood parents of non-white students responding.

4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

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, 44% of the population has a child who was age 2 as of December 1st, and the weighted results indicate that 40% 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 78% of parent respondents had a student with a race/ethnicity of white whereas 67% of children receiving 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

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	0.75%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	0.64%	0.76%	0.76%	0.80%	0.80%
Data	0.82%	0.93%	0.91%	0.96%	0.94%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	0.80%	0.80%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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.

On November 6, 2018, over 60 stakeholders participated in review of and submitted recommendations for Indicators B4A, B4B, and B17 as well as for the School Age and EI/ECSE Special Education Report Cards redesign. 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.

In Fall 2019, stakeholders comprised of all EI/ECSE contractors, subcontractors, and program coordinators participated in target setting for the FFY 2019 Annual Performance Report (APR).

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	445
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/20/2019	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	45,259

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
445	45,259	0.94%	0.80%	0.98%	Met Target	No Slippage

Compare your results to the national data

The FFY 2018 national data for C5 is 1.25 % and the 2018 data for C5 for Oregon is 0.98%, which is 0.27 percentage points below the national average. The difference between the Oregon C5 performance and the 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.

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Baseline	2005	1.78%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	2.20%	2.20%	2.30%	2.30%	2.40%
Data	2.42%	2.59%	2.61%	2.74%	2.92%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	2.40%	2.40%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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.

On November 6, 2018, over 60 stakeholders participated in review of and submitted recommendations for Indicators B4A, B4B, and B17 as well as for the School Age and EI/ECSE Special Education Report Cards redesign. 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.

In Fall 2019, stakeholders comprised of all EI/ECSE contractors, subcontractors, and program coordinators participated in target setting for the FFY 2019 Annual Performance Report (APR).

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	4,388
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/20/2019	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	138,305

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
4,388	138,305	2.92%	2.40%	3.17%	Met Target	No Slippage

Compare your results to the national data

The FFY 2018 national data for C6 is 3.48% and the 2018 data for C6 for Oregon is 3.17%, which is 0.31 percentage points below the national average. The difference between the Oregon C6 performance and the National C6 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.

Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	99.40%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.60%	99.72%	99.56%	99.26%	99.39%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
3,555	4,154	99.39%	100%	99.45%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

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

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

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).

7/2018-6/2019

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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

ODE verified that all programs with noncompliance correctly implemented 34 CFR §§303.310(a) and 303.342(a) and achieved 100% compliance based on a review of Corrective Action Plans (CAPs) detailing the noncompliance and correction and review of subsequent monthly CAP plans for the program.

In FFY 2017, 24 evaluations and initial IFSP meetings did not meet the 45-day timeline for the following reasons: staff communication problems (5), staff illness/family emergency (6), evaluation schedule full (2), district delay in paperwork (2), data entry error (5), and staff training issues (4). The programs with noncompliance developed and implemented CAPs detailing solutions for 100% compliance and submitted these to ODE for review and approval. The CAPs included staff training, development of alternative plans when staff became ill, and working with school districts to hire additional evaluators.

Verification of correction of practices that contributed to the noncompliance as well as current compliance with 34 CFR §§303.310(a) and 303.342(a) was obtained through the following:

- EI Programs with noncompliance submitted a monthly CAP to ODE detailing the noncompliance and correction of practices leading to noncompliance and included in the CAP; 1) the number of days needed to complete the referral, eligibility and initial IFSP meeting, 2) the child's initials and birth date, 3) the specific reasons for not meeting the 45-day timeline, 4) corrective actions based on an analysis of the problem(s), and 5) activities planned to address each problem identified.
- ODE reviewed CAPs, requested clarification when needed, approved completed CAPs and
- ODE reviewed subsequent monthly C7 reports submitted by EI programs to ODE to confirm demonstration of correction of practices and current compliance with 34 CFR §§303.310(a) and 303.342(a).

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 2017 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 an ODE review of their Corrective Action Plans (CAPs) documenting each of the 24 cases of noncompliance (consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02).

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	94.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	90.97%	94.41%	96.58%	95.14%	94.63%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
132	152	94.63%	100%	86.84%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

In FFY 2018, 86.84% (132/152) 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 twenty incidents of noncompliance in thirteen programs. This represents slippage of 7.79 percentage points from FFY 2017 (94.63%).

Slippage may be attributed to inadequate tracking of time tables for 13 children in 13 programs. Additionally, seven of the 13 programs did not include transition steps on the IFSP for seven 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.

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

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

0

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

State monitoring

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) 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 34 CFR §303.700-708.

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.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
8	8	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2017, there were eight incidents of noncompliance that resulted in seven findings across seven programs (one program had two incidents for a total of one finding, and six programs had one incident each for a total of six findings).

ODE verified through data submitted in SPR&I, the state online data system, that 100% (8/8) of incidents of noncompliance in FFY 2017 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 2017, 94.63% (141/149) 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 eight incidents of noncompliance that resulted in seven findings across seven programs (one program had two incidents for a total of one finding, and six programs had one incident each for a total of six findings).

ODE verified through data submission to SPR&I that 100% (8/8) of incidents of noncompliance in FFY 2017 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.

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8B - Indicator Data

Historical Data

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

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

YES

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
152	152	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

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.

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 review of district/program policies, procedures, and systems, to ensure the requirements set forth in 34 CFR §303.700-708 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? (yes/no)

NO

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

State monitoring

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 34 CFR §303.700-708.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)}} \right] \times 100$.

B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$.

C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$.

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8C - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	87.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	88.89%	97.20%	95.21%	97.22%	95.30%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
136	152	95.30%	100%	89.47%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

In FFY 2018, 89.50% (136/152) of child files reviewed for EI transition included evidence of transition 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 a total of sixteen incidents of noncompliance. This represents slippage of 5.80 percentage points from FFY 2017 (95.30%).

Slippage may be attributed to inadequate tracking of time tables for 11 children in nine programs. Additionally, three programs did not include transition steps on the IFSP for five 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.

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

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

0

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

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

0

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

State monitoring

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) 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 34 CFR §303.700-708 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.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
7	7	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2017, 95.30% (142/149) 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 seven findings across seven programs.

ODE verified that 100% (7/7) incidents of noncompliance in FFY 2017 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

Seven individual incidents of noncompliance resulted in seven findings across seven programs. ODE verified through data submission to SPR&I that 100% (7/7) of incidents of noncompliance in FFY 2017 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. ODE also required programs to use SPR&I to provide the cause of the noncompliance, and demonstrate correction of practices that contributed to the noncompliance through subsequent data submissions.

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

9 - Indicator Data

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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.

On November 6, 2018, over 60 stakeholders participated in review of and submitted recommendations for Indicators B4A, B4B, and B17 as well as for the School Age and EI/ECSE Special Education Report Cards redesign. 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.

In Fall 2019, stakeholders comprised of all EI/ECSE contractors, subcontractors, and program coordinators participated in target setting for the FFY 2019 Annual Performance Report (APR).

Historical Data

Baseline					
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target>=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0				N/A	N/A

Targets

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

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

Indicator 10: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

Prepopulated Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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.

On November 6, 2018, over 60 stakeholders participated in review of and submitted recommendations for Indicators B4A, B4B, and B17 as well as for the School Age and EI/ECSE Special Education Report Cards redesign. 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.

In Fall 2019, stakeholders comprised of all EI/ECSE contractors, subcontractors, and program coordinators participated in target setting for the FFY 2019 Annual Performance Report (APR).

Historical Data

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

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

Targets

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

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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