

Oregon

Annual Performance Report (APR)

Part C

2012



2012

Oregon Annual Performance Report (APR)
Part C

Table of Contents

PART C APR INDICATOR	PAGE
Overview	i
C1 Timely IFSP Services	1
C2 Services in the home or community-based settings	4
C3 Improved Outcomes	7
C4 Family Participation	13
C5 Birth to 1 IFSPs	20
C6 Birth to 3 IFSPs	24
C7 45-Day Timeline	28
C8 Timely Transition from Part C to Part B	31
C9 Identification/Correction of Noncompliance Timeline	37
C12 Resolution Settlements	42
C13 Mediation Agreements	43
C14 Timely/Accurate Data Reporting	44

Overview of FFY 2012 Annual Performance Report (APR) and FFY 2012 State Performance Plan (SPP) Development

Part C

Background

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) works daily toward ensuring the provision of quality educational supports for all of Oregon's children. Annually, ODE prepares a performance report for the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) to summarize the activities and events of the year toward meeting the expectations of state and federal law as outlined in our State Performance Plan (SPP). To document these ongoing activities, a primary focus team of ODE staff meets on a regular basis to review and analyze the systems that support the Oregon SPP and to document activities of ongoing improvement.

It is important to note that Oregon has continued to experience economic challenges that have negatively affected some children and their families. These challenges include severe state and program-level budget and staff reductions, decreases in family income, housing instability, and general population shifts. These circumstances directly impact decisions for children with disabilities.

Stakeholder Input

This year the APR indicators for FFY 2013 were reviewed with stakeholders on November 7, 2013 and during seven EI/ECSE regional trainings. Among those invited were parents, representatives of school districts, EI 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 APR/SPP. Stakeholders were also presented with information on the C-11 State Systemic Improvement Plan.

Dissemination

At the time of submission to OSEP, the FFY 2012 SPP and the FFY 2012 APR will be posted on the ODE website at <http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/page/?=1813>. Any revisions that may be necessary following OSEP's review of Oregon's APR and SPP will be made by ODE staff and the appropriate edits will be posted at that time. Notification of the original posting will be sent to all education agencies and other interested parties for Part B and Part C. In addition, a public announcement will also be sent via the statewide message system of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. A press release will be provided to major Oregon newspapers.

Public Reporting

ODE special education staff collaborated with ODE technology and information staff to issue the 2012-2013 Oregon Special Education Report Cards. The ODE Special Education staff and the ODE Public Relations (PR) staff have created an effective system for communication of the required reporting documents. The PR office has the equipment and systems to enhance the communication from ODE to the public and media via print, publications, and the web. With access to the network of key contacts in each geographic area of the state, ODE will communicate all public reporting requirements through the Oregon Special Education Report Cards which will be distributed on April 2, 2014, to districts and programs statewide. ODE will issue a directive to all districts and programs to distribute the report cards to their respective parents. District and program report cards will be posted on the ODE website at <http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/page/?=1831>.

Determination

OSEP's determination for the Oregon Part C FFY 2011 APR and Revised SPP was *meets requirements* for Part C of IDEA. Specific factors affecting this determination included Oregon's reporting of valid and reliable FFY 2011 data reflecting the measurement for each indicator; reporting high levels of compliance or correction of previously identified findings of noncompliance for Indicators C1, C7, C8A, C8B, C8C, and C14; and reporting under Indicator C9 both a high level of compliance in timely correcting FFY 2010 findings of noncompliance and that it verified the correction of FFY 2010 findings of noncompliance

consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Oregon is pleased with the progress made in these areas and continues to consider additional activities that will maintain compliance and secure progress in meeting the targets.

Oregon Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) Program

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

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments

Indicator 1: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

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

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Oregon has a seamless system of services for children with disabilities from birth through age five that is operated by the Oregon Department of Education (ODE). ODE contracts with nine Education Service Districts (ESDs) across the state to provide Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) services in 35 local programs. All of the ESDs either provide services or subcontract with local providers to provide EI/ECSE services. This system includes Part C for children birth to age three and Part B for children from age three to kindergarten age, which is age five in Oregon. Children who are age five by September 1 are eligible for public school with special education services provided by the local school district.

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

All EI/ECSE programs are required to participate in the System Performance Review & Improvement (SPR&I) system of accountability. The SPR&I system focuses on procedural compliance and performance indicators identified through federal and state regulations and previous state accountability findings.

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 early intervention services provided in a timely manner for a predetermined number of child files selected for review.
- Address noncompliance with services implemented in a timely manner through corrective action documented in SPR&I that includes verifying that services were provided to children, an explanation for the cause of the noncompliance, correction of practices that contributed to the noncompliance, and demonstration of current compliance through subsequent data collection as soon as possible and in no case more than one year from identification of noncompliance.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012 (2012-2013)	100% of children with IFSPs receive early intervention services in a timely manner.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

94.7 % = [(144 infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by (152 total infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

IFSPs implemented in a timely manner

FFY	Total number of IFSPs reviewed	Total number timely	Percent timely
2010	142	137	96.5%
2011	148	141	95.3%
2012	152	144	94.7%

Source: SPR&I

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

ODE requires the documentation of reasons for not providing EI services in a timely manner. In FFY 2012, there were eight instances of noncompliance which resulted in eight findings across eight programs. Two of these programs had one instance each of service beginning after the projected start date due to staff scheduling. Five programs had one instance each of services beginning after the projected start date with no explanation. One program could not find evidence of a service beginning by the projected start date. As per ODE timelines, service must occur within ten days when services are listed as starting on the day of the IFSP meeting, or by the projected start date on the IFSP. ODE verified that services were initiated for all eight children.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):**Data Summary**

In FFY 2011, ODE verified that 100% (3/3 findings) of noncompliance representing services to seven children were corrected within one year. This represents three findings across three programs which are reported in indicator C9 for FFY 2012. ODE required these three programs to verify that services were provided to the seven children, provide an explanation for the delay in services, review the practices that contributed to the noncompliance, and demonstrate compliance through additional file reviews. ODE verified that each EI/ECSE program with noncompliance: 1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§ 303.340(c), 303.342(e), 303.344(f)(1) based on a review of updated data through SPR&I; and 2) has initiated IFSP services for each of the seven children at the time of this report.

FFY 2012 procedural compliance data indicate 94.7% (144/152) of early intervention IFSP services were delivered in a timely manner, a decrease of 0.6% from FFY 2011. Eight programs either did not deliver services in a timely manner or had no evidence of the initiation of IFSP services by the start date listed on the IFSP. ODE required these eight programs to verify that services were provided to these eight children, provide an explanation for the delay in services, review the practices that contributed to the noncompliance, and demonstrate compliance through additional file reviews. ODE verified that the eight EI/ECSE programs with noncompliance: 1) are correctly implementing 34 CFR §§ 303.340(c), 303.342(e), 303.344(f)(1) based on a review of updated data through SPR&I; and 2) have initiated IFSP services for each of the eight children.

Improvement Activity 1: ODE will review statewide compliance data, identify barriers to timeliness, and disseminate information to EI/ECSE programs to ensure compliance with this indicator.

Discussion: Barriers to timeliness for the eight programs included program staff scheduling services after the projected start dates, staff illness, a staff not showing up on the service delivery day, and lack of evidence of service initiation by the projected start date. These issues were attributed to individual staff and not program-wide practices. Statewide compliance data, timelines, and documentation of service were addressed in the annual fall SPR&I trainings and targeted technical assistance was provided by ODE to these programs.

Improvement Activity 2: ODE will work with a select number of EI/ECSE programs whose data show both high and low compliance with this indicator to identify effective practices and barriers to compliance with provision of services in a timely manner.

Discussion: Timelines for service delivery were reviewed with all programs during the annual fall SPR&I trainings. Programs with high compliance rates periodically review expectations for timelines throughout the year. ODE contacted the eight programs to review their performance. One program indicated they had changed their staffing to address the issue of a staff not showing on the scheduled service day. All programs were advised to provide reminders to staff regarding the tracking and documentation of service delivery time.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2013 (2013-2014):

No revisions.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 2: 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)

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Oregon has a seamless system of services for children with disabilities from birth through age five that is operated by the Oregon Department of Education (ODE). ODE contracts with nine Education Service Districts (ESDs) across the state to provide Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) services in 35 local programs. All of the ESDs either provide services or subcontract with local providers to provide EI/ECSE services. This system includes Part C for children birth to age three and Part B for children from age three to kindergarten age, which is age five in Oregon. Children who are age five by September 1 are eligible for public school with special education services provided by the local school district.

Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) defines natural environments as “settings that are natural or normal for the child’s age peers who have no disability” (OAR 581-015-2700). These settings include a child’s home, defined as the principal residence of the child’s family or caregivers, or community-based programs such as childcare or Early Head Start that are regularly attended by children without disabilities.

To the maximum extent appropriate, EI services are provided in the home or community-based settings, as determined by the child’s IFSP team. EI services only occur in a setting other than the child’s natural environment if EI services cannot be achieved satisfactorily in the child’s home or other typical setting.

All EI/ECSE programs are required to participate in the System Performance Review & Improvement (SPR&I) system of accountability. The SPR&I process focuses on procedural compliance and performance indicators identified through federal and state regulations and previous state accountability findings.

The standard operating procedures ODE uses for this indicator include:

- Providing programs a Federal Placement Distribution performance indicator report in SPR&I that includes IFSP content requirements related to the provision of EI services in the home or community-based settings and the extent, if any, to which services will not be provided in these settings. The report also includes trend data and current data compared to state targets.
- Providing programs a data analysis worksheet if their federal placement distribution data fall outside the state established performance threshold. ODE reviews program-level analysis to inform findings as part of the SPR&I process.
- Providing programs that are not “justified to meet” with an improvement planning template to document their efforts to serve children in home and community-based settings. ODE reviews program-level improvement plans as part of the SPR&I process.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012 (2012-2013)	80.0% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. All decisions regarding where children receive their IFSP services are made by the child's IFSP team and are based on the individual needs of the child.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

97.0% = [(3,124 infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by (3,219 total infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

**Children with IFSPs receiving EI services
In the home or community-based settings**

FFY	Number receiving EI services	Number receiving EI services in the home or community-based settings	Percentage receiving EI services in the home or community-based settings
2010	2,940	2,775	94.4%
2011	2,990	2,866	95.9%
2012	3,219	3,124	97.0%

Source: Oregon Special Education Child Count (SECC) data

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):**Data Summary**

In FFY 2012, 97.0% (3,124/3,219) of children in EI programs received services in home or community-based settings. This represents a 1.1% increase from FFY 2011, and ODE continues to exceed its target. The progress can be attributed to improvement in sixteen programs providing services in home or community-based settings.

Improvement Activity 1: ODE will provide leadership in working with communities to increase options for provision of EI services in typical settings.

Discussion: In November 2007, a mini-summit on inclusion sponsored by Oregon Employment Department Childcare Division and the Oregon Department of Education was held in Salem, Oregon. All areas of the state were represented and developed action plans that included appropriate referral sources for children in childcare settings suspected of having a disability. This work was continued in FFY 2012 through training and support provided by the Teaching Research Institute at Western Oregon University.

Improvement Activity 2: ODE will provide leadership in targeting Child Find activities in local childcare centers.

Discussion: In November 2007, a mini-summit on inclusion sponsored by Oregon Employment Department Childcare Division and the Oregon Department of Education was held in Salem, Oregon. All areas of the state were represented and developed action plans that included appropriate referral sources for children in childcare settings suspected of having a disability. This work was continued in FFY 2012 through training and support provided by the Teaching Research Institute at Western Oregon University.

Improvement Activity 3: ODE will review statewide Early Intervention placement data and disseminate to EI/ECSE programs effective practices to improve the provision of early intervention services in home or community-based settings

Discussion: In FFY 2012, 16 programs increased the provision of services in home or community based settings. The State's actual target data for provision of services to infants and toddlers in natural environments is 97.0% Oregon continues to exceed the state target on this indicator. Statewide data and effective practices were reviewed during the annual fall SPR&I trainings.

Improvement Activity 4: ODE will provide targeted technical assistance to programs unable to justify performing below state target and not demonstrating improvement from the previous year to improve programs' ability to provide early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

Discussion: In FFY 2011, all programs met or were justified to meet the state target.

In FFY 2012, 34 programs met the state target. The remaining program provided an analysis for their not meeting the target. In this program, the location of services for one child was sufficient to cause the program to not meet the target.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2013 (2013-2014):

No revisions.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 3: 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 USC 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

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 or exited 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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Oregon has a seamless system of services for children with disabilities from birth through age five that is operated by the Oregon Department of Education (ODE). ODE contracts with nine Education Service Districts (ESDs) across the state to provide Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) services in 35 local programs. All ESDs either provide services or subcontract with local providers to provide EI/ECSE services. This system includes Part C for children birth to age three and Part B for children from age three to kindergarten age, which is age five in Oregon. Children who are age five by September 1 are eligible for public school with special education services provided by the local school district.

In summer 2007, based on feedback from EI/ECSE personnel and stakeholders, ODE determined the need for an assessment tool that would meet both OSEP requirements and provide data necessary for developing individual child programs. To meet both of these requirements ODE selected the Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System (AEPS).

Beginning in 2008, all EI/ECSE programs in Oregon are required to enter child AEPS data into the Early Childhood Web (ecWeb) system, starting with all children qualifying for early intervention services in May of 2008.

The standard operating procedures for this indicator include:

- Providing support and technical assistance to programs in their use of the AEPS and the ecWeb online data reporting system.
- Reviewing the ecWeb data collection, verification, and reporting procedures to improve data accuracy.
- Reviewing the progress data with EI/ECSE Contractors.

Criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers”

A table was created for each of the three outcome areas for every month of age from 1 - 36 months for the AEPS. The table indicates the number of points a child needs to score at each month of age to be considered in the normal range of development for that outcome. If a child scores at or above the 50th percentile, he or she is categorized as developing typically. If a child has a score that is below this level, he or she is categorized as below the normal range. Data are reviewed to compare child progress between entry and exit from the program.

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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012 (2012-2013)	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 81.4% of those infants and toddlers who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome A, who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program. 59.4% 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.
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 64.2% of those infants and toddlers who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome B, who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program. 7.6% 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.
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 64.9% of those infants and toddlers who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome C, who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program. 18.4% 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.

Targets and Actual Data for Part C Children Exiting in FFY 2012 (2012-13)

Summary Statements	Actual FFY 2011 percent and number of children	Actual FFY 2012 percent and number of children	Target FFY 2012 percent of children
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)			
1. 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 exited the program. Formula: c+d / a+b+c+d	83.6% (1,099/1,314)	83.0% (1,211/1459)	81.4%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program. Formula: d+e / a+b+c+d+e	61.0% (1,031/1,689)	58.0% (1,053/1,815)	59.4%
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)			
1. 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 exited the program. Formula: c+d / a+b+c+d	58.8% (953/1,620)	62.0% (1,088/1,754)	64.2%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they exited the program. Formula: d+e / a+b+c+d+e	9.1% (154/1,689)	9.7% (176/1,815)	7.6%

Summary Statements	Actual FFY 2011 percent and number of children	Actual FFY 2012 percent and number of children	Target FFY 2012 percent of children
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs			
1 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 exited the program. Formula: $c+d / a+b+c+d$	64.6% (1,013/1,569)	66.7% (1,152/1,726)	64.9%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they exited the program. Formula: $d+e / a+b+c+d+e$	15.9% (269/1,689)	15.4% (280/1,815)	18.4%

Source: ecWeb

Progress Data for Part C Children FFY 2012

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	Percent of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	138	7.6%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	110	6.1%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	514	28.3%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	697	38.4%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	356	19.6%
Total	N=1,815	100.0%
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication):	Number of children	Percent of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	82	4.5%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	584	32.2%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	973	53.6%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	115	6.3%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	61	3.4%
Total	N=1,815	100.0%
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number of children	Percent of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	84	4.6%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	490	27.0%

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number of children	Percent of children
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	961	52.9%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	191	10.5%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	89	4.9%
Total	N=1,815	100.0%

Source: ecWeb

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

Summary Statement 1: 83.0% = [514 infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus 697 infants and toddlers reported in category (d)] divided by [138 infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus 110 infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus 514 infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus 697 infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d)] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: 58.0% = [697 infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus 356 infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e)] divided by [1,815 infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.

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

Summary Statement 1: 62.0% = [973 infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus 115 infants and toddlers reported in category (d)] divided by [82 infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus 584 infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus 973 infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus 115 infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d)] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: 9.7% = [115 infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus 61 infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e)] divided by [1,815 infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Summary Statement 1: 66.7% = [961 infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus 191 infants and toddlers reported in category (d)] divided by [84 infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus 490 infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus 961 infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus 191 infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d)] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: 15.4% = [191 infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus 89 infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e)] divided by [1,815 infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

Discussion of Summary Statements and (a)-(e) Progress Data for FFY 2012:

In FFY 2012, Oregon exceeded outcome targets for A1, B2 and C1. Oregon did not meet the targets for A2, B1 or C2. In FFY 2012, exit data were collected on 1,815 children who had six or more months of service. There was variation in the data from 2011 to 2012 with increases up to 3.2% and decreases up to 3.0%. ODE is reviewing progress data in all categories, including disaggregated data for race/ethnicity and eligibility and working with programs to understand gaps between target and actual outcome data.

In FFY 2012, there were 3,218 children in the Early Intervention program according to the Special Education Child Count (SECC). Of that total, 56.4% (1,815) of children exited with child outcome data. The remaining 1,403 children represent those still in the program or with less than six months service. Typically, a small number of children withdraw from service before exit data are collected.

Improvement Activity 1: ODE will review statewide performance data on positive social-emotional skills, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and use of appropriate behaviors to meet the child's needs, and disseminate information on effective practices to EI/ECSE programs to improve performance with this indicator.

Discussion: ODE reviewed statewide performance data. Information on effective practices to improve performance was disseminated to EI/ECSE program staff at annual fall System Performance Review and Improvement (SPR&I) training and through ongoing technical assistance to individual programs provided by ODE. ODE shared information from webinars and learning communities, conducted by the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center, the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy), and the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA), concerning child outcomes technical assistance at the SEA level. In addition, ODE provides support to selected programs on evidence-based practices, such as Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS).

Improvement Activity 2: ODE will review progress data for this indicator with EI/ECSE Contractors and collaborate on possible EI program changes to increase progress across all outcome areas.

Discussion: Data for this indicator were reviewed at EI/ECSE contractors meetings. Reasons for progress and slippage were reviewed to inform future program changes. Differences between Oregon and national FFY 2011 data were reviewed to improve Oregon's child outcome data system.

ODE provided training and technical assistance on data collection. Discussions also focused the disaggregated data by Race/ethnicity and Eligibility.

Improvement Activity 3: ODE will review statewide performance data with the child outcomes committee to determine data validity and improvements to data collection and analysis.

Discussion: The child outcomes committee conducted a sampling study of child outcome data from one LEA to determine whether including total objective and goal data from the AEPS would significantly change the six summary statements. When it was determined through this sampling that there was no significant change in the data the committee examined the child outcome data system of another state that also used the AEPS statewide. That state's child outcome data is closer to the national child outcome data. The child outcome committee is currently examining whether the other state's use of a different AEPS/Child Outcomes crosswalk as well as use of the objective and goal data to calculate the child outcome data can be replicated in Oregon with positive results.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2013 (2013-2014):

No revisions.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 4: 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 USC 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement:

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Oregon has a seamless system of services for children with disabilities from birth through age five that is operated by the Oregon Department of Education (ODE). ODE contracts with nine Education Service Districts (ESDs) across the state to provide Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) services in 35 local programs. This system includes Part C for children birth to age three and Part B 619 for children from age three to kindergarten age, which is age five in Oregon.

In 2005-2006, in an effort to make data-informed decisions regarding program impact on parent involvement, as a means of improving services and results for children receiving early intervention services, and to gather baseline data for the FFY 2005 APR, ODE adopted the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) *Family Survey—Early Intervention*. ODE contracts with ICF, Inc., to distribute and analyze the NCSEAM survey results. The survey is also provided in Spanish.

Beginning in FFY 2005 and continuing through FFY 2012, ODE surveyed a statewide representative sample of parents of infants and toddlers receiving early intervention services. Each year, the sample will be representative of the total population with respect to race/ethnicity, gender, primary disability and program size. As of FFY 2010, data has been collected from all counties in Oregon. Beginning in FFY 2011, ODE initiated a second cycle of parent surveys based on the current sampling plan.

Oregon Part C Sampling Plan Components

- Description of the sampling frame.
 - A list of the names and addresses of all 3,219 children with addresses served under Part C in Oregon constitutes the sampling frame.
- Description of the stages/cycle of sampling and the units sampled at each stage (e.g., selecting service areas, then programs within service areas, then children within programs).
 - Oregon's Early Intervention programs are administered through nine Service Areas statewide. Two of the Service Areas include only a single (large population) county. In the first survey year of the six year cycle (FFY 2011), one county was randomly selected from six of the eight Service

- Areas, excluding one of the single-county Service Areas. One-sixth of the administrative districts (36 counties) in the state will be sampled each year for six years.
- The FFY 2012 random sampling for one-sixth of the counties resulted in the selection of six counties (Benton, Crook, Grant, Multnomah, Polk and Wheeler). These six counties are served by five service areas and provide services to over 756 families, equaling over 23.5% of the FFY 2012 total EI population (3,219).
 - The same counties will be sampled for Part C and Part B, Section 619.
 - No Service Areas or counties have more than 50,000 children served, so none have to be sampled each of the six years.
 - No Service Areas or counties have more than 2,000 children served, so surveys will be sent to all families receiving services in the counties selected.
 - A new six-year sampling cycle began in FFY 2011.
 - Description of any stratification that is used for each stage of sampling (e.g., program may be stratified by child population, degree of urbanicity, etc.).
 - For the first years of the sampling plan, eight of the nine Service Areas will be selected, excluding one of the large single county Service Areas. Once both of the large single county Service Areas have been sampled (Lane and Clackamas), seven Service Areas will be selected. Then SPSS will be used to randomly select six counties from within these Service Areas.
 - This random sample of 16.7% of the 36 counties is composed of six counties that have a population of over 23.5% (756/3,219) of the total population of families receiving Part C services. Data for two of the services areas is suppressed due to small cell size (< 6).
 - Counties with fewer than 2,000 children served will have surveys mailed to all parents.
 - Counties with more than 2,000 children served (none in this sample) will have surveys mailed to enough parents to ensure that a 20% response rate will provide a 5% margin of error at a 95% confidence level, given the total population of the program.
 - Description of the method/process to collect the data (survey, phone, etc.).
 - Oregon has provided ICF with a mailing list.
 - ICF will check this list against the U.S. Postal Service's list of valid addresses.
 - Duplicates and invalid addresses will be sent back to ODE for correction, deletion, etc.
 - ICF will use a randomization algorithm to select addresses for counties with sample sizes over 2,000 (none in this sample).
 - ICF will mail out surveys, along with a stamped return envelope addressed to Improving Special Education.
 - ICF will scan the returned surveys and produce statistical reports showing the extent to which the population served is represented by the sample.
 - Description of how the survey plan meets the reporting requirements.
 - Roughly one-sixth of the counties will be sampled each year. One-sixth of the counties were sampled in FFY 2011, one-sixth in FFY 2012, and the remaining counties will be sampled (without replacement) in FFY 2013 through 2016.
 - There are no counties with populations of over 50,000 families served, so there are no programs to be included every year of the six-year cycle.
 - Counties with large enough populations (over 2,000) will be sampled in proportions sufficient to arrive as closely as possible to a 5% margin of error with a 95% confidence level.
 - Counties with populations of families served of less than 2,000 will be comprehensively surveyed, with forms sent to every address in the database. In FFY 2012, surveys were sent to all families of children receiving EI services in the six selected counties.

The random sample for FFY 2012 included 16.7% (6/36) of the 36 counties. The six counties selected (Benton, Crook, Grant, Multnomah, Polk and Wheeler) have over 23.5% (756/3,219) of the total population of families receiving Part C services.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012 (2012-2013)	<p>A. 86% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights.</p> <p>B. 85% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs.</p> <p>C. 90% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn.</p>

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

- A. 77% = [(72 respondent families participating in Part C report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by (93 respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100. Standard error of the mean is 0.04%.
- B. 72% = [(67 respondent families participating in Part C reported that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by (93 respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100. Standard error of the mean is 0.05%.
- C. 84% = [(78 respondent families participating in Part C report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by (93 respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100. Standard error of the mean is 0.04%.

The following table shows the three-year trend data for this indicator; baseline data established in FFY 2005.

Indicator	FFY 2010	FFY 2011	FFY 2012
C4-A: Percent of Part C families reporting that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights.	72% (18/25)	85% (49/58)	77% (72/93)
C4-B: Percent of Part C families reporting that early intervention services helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs.	72% (18/25)	81% (47/58)	72% (67/93)
C4-C: Percent of Part C families reporting that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn.	72% (18/25)	95% (55/58)	84% (78/93)

Source: NCSEAM parent survey

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

Data Summary

Oregon did not meet any of the C4 targets in FFY 2012. All three components of this indicator showed slippage from the FFY 2011 results: C4-A declined by 8%, C4-B declined by 9% and C4-C declined by 11% as compared to FFY 2011.

The six counties included in this random sample include over 23.5% (756/3,219) of the total population of families receiving Part C services during FFY 2012. Of the survey respondents, 84.0% (78/93) were from one county program (Multnomah). The response rate was too small in three counties to produce valid results at the county level.

In April 2013, 756 surveys were sent to the parents of children ages birth to three with disabilities who receive services under IDEA Part C and who reside in one of the six counties selected for FFY 2012 (Benton, Crook, Grant, Multnomah, Polk and Wheeler). A total of 93 returned surveys contained sufficient data for analysis, giving a response rate of 12.3% (93/756).

The percents reported for indicators 4A, 4B, and 4C are calculated as the percent of families whose measures are at or above a standard that is specific to each indicator. The standards applied were the

standards recommended by a nationally representative stakeholder group convened by NCSEAM. This group identified items that most closely represented the content of each of the indicator measurements (4A, 4B, and 4C) and recommended the minimum level of agreement that should be required on these items. For measurement 4A the minimum level of agreement recommended was 539, for measurement 4B the minimum level of agreement recommended was 556, and for measurement 4C the minimum level of agreement recommended was 516. The scale ranged from 497 to 677. The percent reported for each indicator is the percent of families with measures on the “Impact of Early Intervention Services on Your Family” scale that are at or above these levels.

The following tables show the population demographics for the entire population of children in Oregon receiving Part C services for FFY 2012.

Race/Ethnicity

	Frequency	Percent
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	40	1.24
Asian	90	2.80
Black	80	2.49
Hispanic	749	23.27
Multi-ethnic	72	2.24
Pacific Islander	17	0.53
White	2,171	67.44
Total	3,219	100.01

Source: SECC, December 2012

Note: More than 100% due rounding numbers

Gender

	Frequency	Percent
Female	1,146	35.60
Male	2,073	64.40
Total	3,219	100.00

Source: SECC, December 2012

Primary Disability

	Frequency	Percent
AUT	54	1.68
D/B	*	*
DD	2,901	90.12
ED	*	*
HI	150	4.66
ID	*	*
OHI	*	*
OI	63	1.96
SLD	*	*
SLP/CD	*	*
TBI	*	*
VI	51	1.58
Total	3,219	100.00

Source: SECC, December 2012

*Data suppressed due to cell size <6

County of Residence

County	Service Area									Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
Baker	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Benton	-	-	-	34	-	-	-	-	-	34
Clackamas	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	338	338
Clatsop	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25	-	25
Columbia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	36	-	36
Coos	-	-	-	53	-	-	-	-	-	53
Crook	-	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11
Curry	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*
Deschutes	-	132	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	132
Douglas	-	-	67	-	-	-	-	-	-	67
Gilliam	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Grant	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Harney	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Hood River	-	-	-	-	-	28	-	-	-	28
Jackson	-	-	203	-	-	-	-	-	-	203
Jefferson	-	33	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33
Josephine	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Klamath	-	-	67	-	-	-	-	-	-	67
Lake	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Lane	-	-	-	-	-	-	362	-	-	362
Lincoln	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*
Linn	-	-	-	86	-	-	-	-	-	86
Malheur	42	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	42
Marion	-	-	-	-	240	-	-	-	-	240
Morrow	16	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16
Multnomah	-	-	-	-	-	668	-	-	-	668
Polk	-	-	-	-	43	-	-	-	-	43
Sherman	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Tillamook	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	-	11
Umatilla	77	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	77
Union	18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18
Wallowa	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Wasco	-	-	-	-	-	26	-	-	-	26
Washington	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	446	-	446
Wheeler	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Yamhill	-	-	-	-	62	-	-	-	-	62
TOTAL	171	183	375	205	345	722	362	518	338	3,219

Source: SECC, December 2012; counties surveyed in FFY 2012 in **bold** font.

*Data suppressed due to cell size <6

“-“ indicates that county is not part of the service area

The following tables reflect the population demographics for the children receiving Part C services whose parents responded to the NCSEAM survey in 2013.

Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Frequency	Percent
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	*	*
Asian	*	*
Black	*	*
Hispanic	19	20.4
Multi-ethnic	*	*
Pacific Islander	*	*
White	64	68.8
Total	93	100.0

Source: ICF NCSEAM data

*Note: Data suppressed due to cell size <6.

Gender

	Frequency	Percent
Female	36	38.7
Male	57	61.3
Total	93	100.0

Source: ICF NCSEAM data

Primary Disability

	Frequency	Percent
AUT	*	*
D/B	*	*
DD	85	91.4
ED	*	*
HI	*	*
ID	*	*
OHI	*	*
OI	*	*
SLD	*	*
SLP/CD	*	*
TBI	*	*
VI	*	*
Total	93	100.0

Source: ICF NCSEAM data

*Note: Data suppressed due to cell size <6.

County of Residence

	Frequency	Percent
Benton	8	8.6
Crook	*	*
Grant	*	*
Multnomah	79	84.9
Polk	6	6.5
Wheeler	*	*
Total	93	100.0

Source: ICF NCSEAM data

*Note: Data suppressed due to cell size <6.

Improvement Activity 1: ODE will provide districts/programs a sample letter they may use at annual IFSP meetings to explain the ways in which the information is used in the program's annual Special Education Report Card.

Discussion: In an effort to increase response rates, ODE developed and distributed a sample letter to all programs to use during annual IFSP meetings. The letter explained the purpose of the NCSEAM parent survey and how the information is publically reported in the program Special Education Report Card. The sample letter encouraged parent participation in all aspects of their child's education.

Improvement Activity 2: Prior to the distribution of the NCSEAM survey, ODE will notify local advocacy groups of the upcoming survey and enlist their assistance in promoting the survey and answering parent questions.

Discussion: ODE notified a small number of local advocacy groups regarding the survey. Parents were encouraged to contact ODE directly if they had questions regarding the survey.

Improvement Activity 3: ODE will collaborate with Family and Community Together (FACT), Oregon's designated Parent Training and Information Center, to develop resources, supports and training options for families of students with disabilities and program personnel.

Discussion: FACT presented two IDEA information sessions for parents that included information on the IFSP process. Training materials were also distributed through the FACT outreach programs for non-English speaking and underserved populations. FACT maintained a special education helpline and distributed a minority outreach newsletter to Latino, Russian, Asian, African American and Native American communities in Oregon.

Improvement Activity 4: ODE will provide programs selected for the NCSEAM parent survey a flyer for parents explaining the purpose of the survey, encouraging parent participation and providing contact information for questions. Prior to the mailing of the NCSEAM parent survey, the selected programs will distribute the flyer to parents of children with disabilities who reside in their county.

Discussion: ODE developed and distributed an informational flyer for programs selected for the FFY 2012 NCSEAM survey. The programs were asked to distribute the flyer to the parents of children with disabilities. The flyer included information regarding the survey, how the results would be used, encouraged parent participation and provided ODE contact information.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2013 (2013-2014):

No revisions.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 5: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Local Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) programs and school districts have joint and separate responsibilities for locating, identifying, and evaluating all children birth to age one who reside within their jurisdiction and are suspected of being eligible for EI services. There are 35 EI/ECSE programs. In one instance, there is a program located within the geographic boundaries of another program. Due to these shared boundaries, the data for these two programs is consolidated for this indicator, resulting in data being reported on a total of 34 programs.

The following are joint EI/ECSE and school district responsibilities:

- Conducting public awareness activities including announcements on television, radio, and in newspapers; presentations at community meetings; and outreach to those who may not understand English, who may move frequently, or who may live in rural or isolated areas.
- Disseminating to parents the EI/ECSE brochure and materials developed by local programs on the availability of EI/ECSE services, including materials for non-English speaking families; information includes how to make a referral and how to obtain an eligibility evaluation for EI/ECSE services.
- Developing communication links with community agencies that provide services to the children who may be eligible for EI/ECSE, including the dissemination of child find materials to hospitals, clinics, public health agencies, pediatricians, pediatric nurses, Head Start, Early Head Start, community preschools, childcare providers, and social service professionals involved in family or child services.
- Publishing notices before any major child find activity, which inform parents that confidentiality requirements apply to these activities. Circulation of this notice must be adequate to inform parents within the jurisdiction of the EI/ECSE program and school district.

Local school districts are responsible, financially and legally, for EI/ECSE eligibility evaluations. School districts may contract with local EI/ECSE programs or another entity to fulfill these requirements.

The following are required in evaluating children for EI/ECSE eligibility:

- Administering and scoring tests, interpreting evaluation scores, conducting child observations, gathering developmental histories, conducting parent interviews, and writing evaluation reports.
- Evaluating children referred for an EI eligibility evaluation within 45 calendar days from referral to IFSP.
- Conducting ECSE eligibility evaluations for children enrolled in EI and approaching their third birthday (OAR 581-015-2805).
- Evaluating children referred for an ECSE eligibility evaluation within 60 school days of parent consent for evaluation.

Local EI/ECSE programs are responsible for providing a referral and evaluation process in each county that includes the following:

- Providing a year-round primary contact that receives and processes referrals for children suspected of being eligible for EI/ECSE services.

- Assuring that all children referred as suspected of having a disability are referred to the child's local school district or agency contracted by the district, for EI/ECSE eligibility evaluations.
- Assisting the local school districts to meet the responsibility for eligibility evaluations for EI services within 45 calendar days from referral which can be accomplished by forming evaluation consortia through district contracts with ESDs and other sources.
- Convening teams to determine eligibility for EI/ECSE services.
- Assuring eligibility determinations are conducted in compliance with applicable federal and Oregon statutes, regulations, and guidelines.
- Referring children who are eligible for EI/ECSE services to the county's EI/ECSE program for the development of the IFSP and placement in appropriate services.
- Assuring child find materials are disseminated to non-English-speaking families and are available in locations frequented by families of young children.

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) works with other agencies to assure the early identification of infants and toddlers with, or with the likelihood of developing, developmental delay(s), including:

- Development of a Memorandum of Understanding with the Oregon Department of Human Services (DHS) Child Welfare Division to assure that all children birth to age three who are victims of substantiated child abuse or neglect, including children who are substantiated as affected by illegal substance abuse or withdrawal symptoms resulting from prenatal exposure, receive developmental screening and are referred to local EI/ECSE programs. These policies and procedures meet the requirements under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) and IDEA 2004. ODE annually reviews county-level CAPTA agreements.
- Development of a Memorandum of Understanding with the Oregon Health Authority (OHA, formerly Department of Human Services) Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Program (EHDI) to implement a law requiring follow-up for infants who are suspected of being deaf or hearing impaired. ODE works with the EHDI program to monitor referrals made to EI/ECSE programs to ensure follow through with these infants and their families. These policies and procedures assure that infants are referred immediately to the EI/ECSE program and that the EI/ECSE program follows up with the DHS EHDI program with the status of the infant's enrollment in the EI/ECSE program.
- Development of an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Office of Head Start/Early Head Start, Region X Head Start/Early Head Start, Region XI American Indian/Alaska Native Head Start and Region XII Migrant/Seasonal Head Start to assure that infants and their families receive timely referrals to the EI program and that the Head Start and EI programs work collaboratively to meet the individual needs of the child and his or her family.

The standard operating procedures for this indicator include:

- Requiring all EI/ECSE programs to report monthly on numbers of infants and toddlers referred and the sources of the referrals.
- Providing programs a data analysis worksheet if their data fall outside the state established performance threshold and they are not "justified to meet" the target.
- Providing programs an improvement planning template to document their efforts to identify children birth to age one who are eligible for EI services.
- Reviewing program-level analyses and improvement plans to inform findings as part of the System Performance Review and Improvement (SPR&I) process.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012 (2012-2013)	0.64% of infants and toddlers, birth to 1, in conformance with state eligibility requirements, are determined eligible for early intervention services and have IFSPs.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

0.80% = [(361 infants and toddlers birth to one with IFSPs) divided by (45,237 infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to 1.06% = [(42,225 infants and toddlers birth to one with IFSPs) divided by (3,983,689 infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to national data.

Infants birth to one receiving Early Intervention Services

Year	Oregon			National		
	Total number of children	Total number of children receiving early intervention services	Percent of children receiving early intervention services	Total number of children	Total number of children receiving early intervention services	Percent of children receiving early intervention services
2010-2011	46,042	305	0.66%	3,989,384	40,962	1.03%
2011-2012	46,460	354	0.76%	4,038,193	41,453	1.03%
2012-2013	45,237	361	0.80%	3,983,689	42,225	1.06%

Source: The U.S. Bureau of the Census, Special Education Child Count (SECC), OSEP Tables (State Eligibility Tables)

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

Data Summary

In FFY 2012, Oregon’s percentage of infants receiving EI services was 0.80%, an increase of 0.04% from FFY 2011, which exceeded the target of 0.64%.

Improvement Activity 1: ODE will work with state-level interagency partners including health, mental health, and child care to ensure referrals of infants who may be eligible for early intervention.

Discussion: ODE continued to contract with the University of Oregon to operate a confidential online developmental screening system for parents and caregivers using both the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) and the Ages and Stages Questionnaire: Social Emotional (ASQ-SE.) Data indicated that respondents living in Oregon conducted 322 online ASQ screenings of children birth to one.

ODE staff participated in Oregon’s Inclusive Child Care Committee. This program provides support and professional development to child care providers to help enable them to identify and include children with disabilities. This group is investigating how to proceed with utilizing the ASQ online system for child care providers.

During FFY 2012, ODE staff met quarterly with the Early Hearing Detection and Intervention (EHDI) advisory board to help ensure that children birth to one with hearing impairments were referred in a timely manner to local Early Intervention programs.

ODE staff and three Regional Low Incidence Disabilities programs partnered to solve systems issues for children birth to one who were referred to EI with hearing concerns, most notably evaluations and hearing aid fittings.

Oregon’s State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) membership includes representatives from children’s mental health, Maternal and Child Health (public health) who, along with the rest of the SICC, advise and assist ODE on various issues, including birth to one child find.

Improvement Activity 2: ODE will provide targeted technical assistance to EI/ECSE programs performing below state targets, that are not “justified to meet” the target, and which do not demonstrate improvement from the previous year for this indicator.

Discussion: In FFY 2011, three programs failed to meet the state target for this indicator and were required to submit worksheets analyzing their birth to one child find efforts. All three programs submitted improvement plans last year, and have subsequently met the target for this indicator in 2012.

In FFY 2012, two programs did not meet the target for birth to one child find. These programs submitted worksheets analyzing their data and submitted improvement plans to ODE for their birth to one child find efforts. ODE reviewed and monitored improvement plans, and provided technical assistance to these programs.

The remaining 32 programs either met the target or were “justified to meet” on the basis that the program’s child count either increased from 2011, or was within two or fewer of the expected count.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2013 (2013-2014):

No revisions.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 6: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

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

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

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Local Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) programs and school districts have joint and separate responsibilities for locating, identifying, and evaluating all children birth to age three who reside within their jurisdiction and are suspected of being eligible for EI services. There are 35 EI/ECSE programs. In one instance, there is a program located within the geographic boundaries of another program. Due to these shared boundaries, the data for these two programs is consolidated for this indicator, resulting in data being reported on a total of 34 programs.

The following are joint EI/ECSE and school district responsibilities:

- Conducting public awareness activities including announcements on television, radio, and in newspapers; presentations at community meetings; and outreach to those who may not understand English, who may move frequently, or who may live in rural or isolated areas.
- Disseminating to parents the EI/ECSE brochure and materials developed by local programs on the availability of EI/ECSE services, including materials for non-English speaking families; information includes how to make a referral and how to obtain an eligibility evaluation for EI/ECSE services.
- Developing communication links with community agencies that provide services to the children who may be eligible for EI/ECSE, including the dissemination of child find materials to hospitals, clinics, public health agencies, pediatricians, pediatric nurses, Head Start, Early Head Start, community preschools, childcare providers, and social service professionals involved in family or child services.
- Publishing notices, before any major child find activity, which inform parents that confidentiality requirements apply to these activities. Circulation of this notice must be adequate to inform parents within the jurisdiction of the EI/ECSE program and school district.

Local school districts are responsible, financially and legally, for EI/ECSE eligibility evaluations. School districts may contract with local EI/ECSE programs or another entity to fulfill these requirements.

The following are required in evaluating children for EI/ECSE eligibility:

- Administering and scoring tests, interpreting evaluation scores, conducting child observations, gathering developmental histories, conducting parent interviews, and writing evaluation reports.
- Evaluating children referred for an EI eligibility evaluation within 45 calendar days from referral to IFSP.
- Conducting ECSE eligibility evaluations for children enrolled in EI and approaching their third birthday (OAR 581-015-2805).
- Evaluating children referred for an ECSE eligibility evaluation within 60 school days of parent consent for evaluation.

Local EI/ECSE programs are responsible for providing a referral and evaluation process in each county that includes the following:

- Providing a year-round primary contact that receives and processes referrals for children suspected of being eligible for EI/ECSE services.

- Assuring that all children referred as suspected of having a disability are referred to the child’s local school district or agency contracted by the district, for EI/ECSE eligibility evaluations.
- Assisting the local school districts to meet the responsibility for eligibility evaluations for EI services within 45 calendar days from referral which can be accomplished by forming evaluation consortia through district contracts with ESDs and other sources.
- Convening teams to determine eligibility for EI/ECSE services.
- Assuring eligibility determinations are conducted in compliance with applicable federal and Oregon statutes, regulations, and guidelines.
- Referring children who are eligible for EI/ECSE services to the county’s EI/ECSE program for the development of the IFSP and placement in appropriate services.
- Assuring child find materials are disseminated to non-English-speaking families and are available in locations frequented by families of young children.

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) works with other agencies to assure the early identification of infants and toddlers with, or with the likelihood of developing developmental delay(s), including:

- Development of a Memorandum of Understanding with the Oregon Department of Human Services (DHS) Child Welfare Division to assure that all children birth to age three who are victims of substantiated child abuse or neglect, including children who are substantiated as affected by illegal substance abuse or withdrawal symptoms resulting from prenatal exposure, receive developmental screening and are referred to local EI/ECSE programs. These policies and procedures meet the requirements under the Child Abuse and Prevention Treatment Act (CAPTA) and IDEA 2004. ODE annually reviews county-level CAPTA agreements.
- Development of a Memorandum of Understanding with the Oregon Health Authority (OHA, formerly the Department of Human Services) Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Program (EHDI) to implement a law requiring follow-up for infants who are suspected of being deaf or hearing impaired. ODE works with the EHDI program to monitor referrals made to EI/ECSE programs to ensure follow through with these infants and their families. These policies and procedures assure that infants are referred immediately to the EI/ECSE program and that the EI/ECSE program follows up with the DHS EHDI program with the status of the infant’s enrollment in the EI/ECSE program.
- Development of an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Office of Head Start /Early Head Start, Region X Head Start/Early Head Start, Region XI American Indian/Alaska Native Head Start and Region XII Migrant/Seasonal Head Start to assure that infants and their families receive timely referrals to the EI program and that the Head Start and EI programs work collaboratively to meet the individual needs of the child and his or her family.

The standard operating procedure for this indicator includes:

- Requiring all EI/ECSE programs to report monthly on numbers of infants and toddlers referred and the sources of the referrals.
- Providing programs a data analysis worksheet if their data fall outside the state established performance threshold and they are not “justified to meet” the target.
- Providing programs an improvement planning template to document their efforts to identify children birth to age three who are eligible for EI services.
- Reviewing program-level analyses and improvement plans to inform findings as part of the System Performance Review and Improvement (SPR&I) process.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2012 (2012-2013)</p>	<p>2.2% of infants and toddlers, birth to 3, in conformance with state eligibility requirements, are determined eligible for early intervention services and have IFSPs.</p>

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

2.35% = [(3,219 infants and toddlers birth to three with IFSPs) divided by (137,067 infants and toddlers birth to three)] times 100 compared to 2.77% = [(333,542 infants and toddlers birth to three with IFSPs) divided by (12,028,122 infants and toddlers birth to three)] times 100 compared to national data.

Infants and toddlers birth to three receiving Early Intervention Services

Year	Oregon			National		
	Total number of children	Total number of children receiving early intervention services	Percent of children receiving early intervention services	Total number of children	Total number of children receiving early intervention services	Percent of children receiving early intervention services
2010-2011	141,405	2,940	2.08%	12,152,003	342,389	2.82%
2011-2012	139,661	2,990	2.14%	12,066,342	336,519	2.79%
2012-2013	137,067	3,219	2.35%	12,028,122	333,542	2.77%

Source: The U.S. Bureau of the Census, Secure Education Child Count (SECC), OSEP Tables (State Eligibility Tables)

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):**Data Summary**

In FFY 2012, Oregon's percentage of infants and toddlers birth to three receiving EI services was 2.35%, an increase of 0.21% from FFY 2011, which exceeded the target of 2.20%.

Improvement Activity 1: ODE will work with state-level interagency partners including health, mental health, and child care to ensure referrals of infants and toddlers who may be eligible for early intervention.

Discussion: ODE continued to contract with the University of Oregon to operate a confidential online developmental screening system for parents and caregivers using both the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) and the Ages and Stages Questionnaire: Social Emotional (ASQ-SE.) Data for FFY 2012 indicated that respondents living in Oregon conducted 1,028 online ASQ screenings of infants and toddlers ages birth to three years.

ODE staff participated in Oregon's Inclusive Child Care Committee. This program provides support and professional development to child care providers to help enable them to identify and include children with disabilities. This group is investigating how to proceed with utilizing the ASQ online system for child care providers.

During FFY 2012, ODE staff met quarterly with the Early Hearing Detection and Intervention (EHDI) advisory board to help ensure that children birth to three with hearing impairments were referred in a timely manner to local Early Intervention programs.

ODE staff and three Regional Low Incidence Disabilities programs partnered to solve systems issues for children birth to three who were referred to EI with hearing concerns, most notably evaluations and hearing aid fittings.

Oregon's State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) membership includes representatives from children's mental health, Maternal and Child Health (public health), and child care who, along with the rest of the SICC, advise and assist the department on various issues, including child find for children birth to three.

Improvement Activity 2: ODE will provide targeted technical assistance to EI/ECSE programs performing below state targets, that are not "justified to meet" the target, and which do not demonstrate improvement from the previous year for this indicator.

Discussion: In FFY 2011, seven of 34 programs failed to meet the state target for this indicator and met the criteria for technical assistance from ODE. All seven programs were required to submit

worksheets analyzing their birth to three child find efforts. Of these, one program demonstrated immediate improvement of child find results due to improved collaboration with referral sources, notably daycare providers, community preschools, and Head Start and was justified to meet. The remaining six programs were required to complete improvement plans. ODE reviewed and monitored improvement plans, and provided technical assistance to these six programs.

In FFY 2012, seven programs failed to meet this year's target and were required to complete worksheets. Of these, two programs' worksheets were justified to meet and five were required to submit improvement plans; of these five, three were required to revise improvement plans from last year and resubmit. ODE reviewed and monitored improvement plans, and provided technical assistance to these five programs. All programs received training in fall 2013.

The remaining 28 programs either met the target or were "justified to meet" on the basis that the program's child count either increased from the prior year or was within two or fewer of the expected count.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2013 (2013-2014):

No revisions.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/Child Find

Indicator 7: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and 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)

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Oregon has a seamless system of services for children with disabilities from birth through age five that is operated by the Oregon Department of Education (ODE). ODE contracts with nine Education Service Districts (ESDs) across the state to provide Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) services in 35 local programs. All of the ESDs either provide services or subcontract with local providers to provide EI/ECSE services. This system includes Part C for children birth to age three and Part B for children from age three to kindergarten age, which is age five in Oregon. Children who are age five by September 1 are eligible for public school with special education services provided by the local school district.

Each Oregon county has a designated referral and evaluation agency that acts as the single point of entry for children into the EI/ECSE system. When an early intervention referral is received by the designated agency, the agency works with the family to schedule an early intervention eligibility evaluation. Local school districts have the legal and fiscal responsibility for conducting EI eligibility evaluations. Most districts contract with the local EI/ECSE program to fulfill the evaluation responsibilities, including conducting the evaluation within 45 days. When the evaluation is complete, the EI/ECSE program convenes a team to determine EI eligibility and if eligibility is established, develop the initial IFSP. The EI/ECSE program is responsible for conducting initial IFSP (Individualized Family Service Plan) meetings within 45 days of the child's referral to the program.

The standard operating procedures for this indicator include:

- EI/ECSE programs submit monthly 45-day timeline data to ODE.
- ODE notifies the area contractor and county coordinator of noncompliance with the 45-day timeline (34 CFR §§303.310(a) and 303.342(a)).
- EI/ECSE programs submit a corrective action plan (CAP) for any child for whom the 45-day timeline was not met. Included in the CAP are:
 - The number of days needed to complete the referral, eligibility and initial IFSP meeting.
 - The child's initials and birth date.
 - The specific reasons for not meeting the 45-day timeline.
 - Corrective actions based on an analysis of the problem(s).
 - Activities planned to address each problem identified.
- ODE verifies that each program with noncompliance is correctly implementing the 45-day timeline through review of subsequent monthly data submissions (achieving 100% compliance).
- ODE requires additional corrective action for programs showing ongoing noncompliance.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012 (2012-2013)	100% of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs will have evaluation, assessment, and initial IFSP meetings conducted within 45 days.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

99.7% = [(4,120 infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline) divided by the (4,132 infants and with IFSPs evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.

The percentage was calculated using data collected monthly from all EI/ECSE programs in the state. The data are cumulative from July 1 through June 30 every year.

EI evaluations and initial IFSP meetings completed in 45 days

Year	Percent of EI evaluations and initial IFSP meetings completed within 45 days
2010-2011	99.8% (3,483/3,489)
2011-2012	99.6% (3,664/3,678)
2012-2013	99.7% (4,120/4,132)

Source: Monthly EI/ECSE reports to ODE

FFY 2012 data include 130 EI evaluations and initial IFSP meetings justified as meeting the 45-day timeline due to documented family or other circumstances outside of the EI/ECSE program's control. Justified circumstances for not meeting the 45-day timeline were determined by ODE personnel and included parents not responding to multiple documented attempts to schedule evaluations or initial IFSP meetings (23), family move (5), parents not attending scheduled evaluation, eligibility and/or IFSP meeting (20), family illness (25), family vacation (9), parent request (46), and family emergency (2).

Account of untimely evaluations, assessments and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delay

In FFY 2011, there were 14 incidents of noncompliance. These 14 incidents resulted in six findings across six programs. Three programs had a total of one incident each for a total of three findings; two programs had two incidents for a total of two findings; and one program had seven incidents for a total of one finding. ODE verified that 100% (14/14) of incidents of noncompliance in FFY 2011 were corrected within one year and that the programs with noncompliance (1) correctly implemented 34 CFR §§303.310(a) and 303.342(a) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of subsequent monthly data, and (2) conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, for any child for whom the 45-day timeline was not met, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the program.

In FFY 2012, 12 evaluations and initial IFSP meetings did not meet the 45-day timeline for the following reasons: staff communication problems (1), staff illness (1), evaluation schedule full (7), data entry error (1), and staff training issues (2). The programs with noncompliance developed and implemented CAPs detailing solutions for 100% compliance. The CAPs included staff training, development of alternative plans when staff became ill, and working with school districts to hire additional evaluators.

In FFY 2012, there were 12 incidents of noncompliance. These 12 incidents resulted in four findings across four programs. Two programs had a total of one incident each for a total of two findings; one program had three incidents for a total of one finding; and one program had seven incidents for a total of one finding. ODE verified that 100% (12/12) of the incidents of noncompliance in FFY 2012 were corrected within one year. Programs with noncompliance (1) correctly implemented 34 CFR §§303.310(a) and

303.342(a) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of subsequent monthly data, and (2) conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, for any child for whom the 45-day timeline was not met based on a review of their CAPs, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

Data Summary

In FFY 2012, 99.7% (4,120/4,132) of early intervention eligibility evaluations and initial IFSPs were completed within the established 45-day timeline, an increase of 0.1% from FFY 2011.

Improvement Activity 1: ODE will review statewide compliance data, identify barriers to the completion of evaluation, assessment, and initial IFSP meetings being conducted within 45 days, and disseminate information to EI/ECSE programs to ensure compliance with this indicator.

Discussion: ODE reviewed and distributed information on the identified barriers to 100% compliance for FFY 2012. These included staff communication problems, staff illness, full evaluation schedule, data entry error, and staff training issues.

Improvement Activity 2: ODE will work with a select number of EI/ECSE programs whose data show both high and low compliance with this indicator to identify effective practices and barriers to compliance with the 45-day timeline.

Discussion: ODE contacted programs with the highest and lowest compliance for FFY 2012. Barriers to meeting the 45-day timeline included scheduling issues after program breaks, full evaluation schedules, and staff communication issues. Effective practices included adding additional evaluation days following vacations and additional FTE for evaluations. Staff trainings, referral tracking spreadsheets and family reminder calls the day before an evaluation were also given as effective practices to meet the 45 day timeline.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2013 (2013-2014):

No revisions.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Indicator 8: 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)

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 delay.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Oregon has a seamless system of services for children with disabilities from birth through age five that is operated by the Oregon Department of Education (ODE), the lead agency for EI/ECSE programs. ODE contracts with nine Education Service Districts (ESDs) across the state to provide Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) services in 35 local programs. All of the ESDs either provide services or subcontract with local providers to provide EI/ECSE services. This system includes Part C for children birth to age three and Part B for children from age three to kindergarten age, which is age five in Oregon. While there are some eligibility differences between early intervention and early childhood special education, the program is seamless in its delivery of services in an effort to minimize transitions for families. Most children who receive EI services continue to receive ECSE services at age three.

ODE requires EI/ECSE programs to have an Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) meeting in which transition is addressed at least 90 days and, with the family's permission, up to nine months prior to the third birthday of children receiving early intervention services. Transition is addressed at this IFSP meeting and includes the following:

- Educating parents about future services, placements, and other matters related to the child's transition.
- Planning the child's eligibility evaluation for ECSE (Part B) services.

- Planning procedures to prepare the child for changes in service delivery, including steps to help the child adjust to and function in the new setting or steps to exit from the EI program.
- Reviewing the child’s program options for the period from the child’s third birthday through the remainder of the school year.
- Transmitting information (with parental consent) about the child to the ECSE program or other service provider, if different from the child’s EI program.

The EI/ECSE program is required to ensure that parental consent for ECSE evaluation is obtained, the evaluation conducted, and eligibility determined. For children eligible for ECSE services, an ECSE IFSP meeting is required to be held to develop the ECSE IFSP, determine ECSE placement, and obtain parent consent for initial placement in special education. ECSE eligibility and implementation of services for children found eligible are required to be in place by the child’s third birthday. For children not eligible for ECSE services, the child’s IFSP team develops a transition plan to support the child’s transition to other services or to exit the program. The plan includes referrals to other services when appropriate.

Children evaluated for Part C services are known to the school district (LEA) because it is responsible, financially and legally, for both EI and ECSE eligibility evaluations. The district also provides transportation, when necessary, for children and their families to access EI services and conducts ECSE eligibility evaluations for children enrolled in EI as children approach their third birthday. Therefore, additional notification to the district, when a child approaches age three, is not necessary. If the ECSE provider is different from the child’s EI provider, then notification, with parent consent, is provided to the new service provider.

Oregon has not adopted the optional 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 §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to “opt out” of the referral.

All EI/ECSE programs are required to participate in System Performance Review & Improvement (SPR&I). The SPR&I system focuses on procedural compliance and performance indicators identified through federal and state regulations and previous state accountability findings.

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. See the EI Transition Checklist below.
- 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.

EI Transition Checklist

	EI Transition	Comments		
200	A transition conference occurred at least 90 days and, at the discretion of the parties involved, up to nine months prior to the child’s third birthday. §300.101, §303.209. Choose "NA" only if the delay was caused by parents and provide an explanation of what happened.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> NA

Guidance 200: If the conference occurred less than 90 days prior to the child's third birthday, provide the reason. With the approval of the child's family and in accordance with OAR 581-015-2810, a transition meeting to establish a transition plan must be held at least 90 calendar days, and at the discretion of the parties, up to nine months before the child's third birthday.			
201	The child's EI IFSP contains/contained transition steps and services. Transition steps were developed at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the third birthday. §303.344; OAR 581-015-2805	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Guidance 201: Steps should indicate procedures to prepare the child for changes in service delivery, including steps to help the child adjust to and function in a new setting, or, if appropriate, steps to exit from the program. Transition steps must be developed at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the third birthday.			

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012 (2012-2013)	<p>A. 100% of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C have an IFSP with transition steps and services to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services developed at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday.</p> <p>B. 100% of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C have the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides notified at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.</p> <p>C. 100% of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C have a transition conference at least 90 calendar days, and, at the discretion of the parties, up to nine months before the third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.</p>

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

- A. 100.0% = [(142 toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with transition steps and services to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services developed at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday) divided by (142 children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- B. 100% = [(142 toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C have the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides notified at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by (142 toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.¹
- C. 95.1% = [(135 toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C have a transition conference at least 90 calendar days, and, at the discretion of the parties, up to nine months before the third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (142 children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

¹ All children receiving EI services are already known to the ECSE program since both EI and ECSE services are delivered by the same program. Also, children transitioning from Part C to Part B are already known to the school district because the school district is responsible (under state law) for EI and ECSE evaluations and transportation services.

Comparison data: EI Transition

Year	A. Number of children exiting Part C with transition steps and services	B. Number of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred	C. Number of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred
2010-2011	99.3% (133/134)	100% (134/134)	94.0% (126/134)
2011-2012	98.5% (135/137)	100% (137/137)	94.9% (130/137)
2012-2013	100% (142/142)	100% (142/142)	95.1% (135/142)

Source: SPR&I

Account of untimely transition procedures

	Transition steps	Transition conference			
	No transition steps listed	No evidence of transition conference	Transition conference <90 days before child's third birthday	Transition conference >9 months before child's third birthday	Parent did not provide approval for transition conference
Total	0	0	3	4	0

Source: SPR&I

Untimely Transition Procedures: Reasons for delay

Three transition conferences were conducted less than 90 days before the child's third birthday and four transition conferences were conducted more than nine months before the child's third birthday due to miscalculation of timelines on the part of EI/ECSE staff.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

Data Summary

All programs with noncompliance were required to complete corrective actions. ODE verified for C8A that each EI program with noncompliance (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.209 and 303.344(h) based on a review of updated data through SPR&I, and (2) has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EI program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. ODE verified for C8C that each EI program with noncompliance (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §303.209 based on a review of updated data through SPR&I, and (2) has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EI program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

A. Transition steps and services

ODE verified that 100% (2/2) of incidents of noncompliance in FFY 2011 were corrected within one year and the program with noncompliance (1) correctly implemented 34 CFR §§303.209 and 303.344(h) based on a review of updated data through SPR&I, and (2) developed an IFSP with transition steps and services for each child, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EI program, consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02.

In FFY 2012, 100% (142/142) of child files reviewed for EI transition included transition steps and services to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by the child's third birthday. This represents progress of 1.5% from FFY 2011 (98.5%).

B1. Notification to LEA

In FFY 2012, 100% of LEAs were notified of children (142/142) potentially eligible for Part B services. Oregon's EI/ECSE program has an electronic, web-based data system called ecWeb. This system is used to notify local EI/ECSE programs and ODE EI/ECSE personnel of children approaching their third birthday and exiting EI services. ecWeb information includes the child's name, date of birth and parent's contact information. Through the ecWeb notification system, ECSE LEA programs and ODE were notified at least 90 days prior to the child's third birthday of 100% (142/142) of the children potentially eligible for Part B preschool services. Children evaluated for Part C services are known to the school district (LEA) because it is responsible, financially and legally, for both EI and ECSE eligibility evaluations. The district also provides transportation, when necessary, for children and their families to access EI services and conducts ECSE eligibility evaluations for children enrolled in EI as children approach their third birthday. Children receiving EI services are known to the ECSE program since both EI and ECSE services are delivered by the same program.

B2. Notification to SEA

ODE is the lead agency for Part C. In FFY 2012, the SEA (ODE) was notified of 100% (142/142) of children's files reviewed for this indicator as potentially eligible for Part B services. Oregon's EI/ECSE program has an electronic, web-based data system called ecWeb. This system is used to notify local EI/ECSE programs and ODE EI/ECSE personnel of all children approaching their third birthday and exiting EI services. ecWeb information includes the child's name, date of birth and parent's contact information. Through the ecWeb notification system, ECSE LEA programs and ODE as the SEA were notified at least 90 days prior to the child's third birthday of the children potentially eligible for Part B services. Children evaluated for Part C services are known to the school district (LEA) because it is responsible, financially and legally, for both EI and ECSE eligibility evaluations. The district also provides transportation, when necessary, for children and their families to access EI services and conducts ECSE eligibility evaluations for children enrolled in EI as children approach their third birthday. Children receiving EI services are known to the ECSE program since both EI and ECSE services are delivered by the same program.

C. Transition conference

In FFY 2011, there were seven incidents of noncompliance. These seven incidents resulted in four findings across four programs. One program had three incidents for a total of one finding; one program had two incidents for a total of one finding; and two programs had one incident for a total of two findings. These four findings have been reported in indicator C9 for FFY 2012. ODE verified that 100% (7/7) of incidents of noncompliance in FFY 2011 were corrected within one year and that the programs with noncompliance (1) correctly implemented 34 CFR §303.209 based on a review of updated data through SPR&I, and (2) developed an IFSP with transition steps and services for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EI program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

In FFY 2012, 95.1% (135/142) 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 five findings across five programs (one program had three incidents for a total of one finding, and four programs had one incident each for a total of four findings). This represents progress of 0.2% from FFY 2011 (94.9%).

ODE verified that 100% (7/7) of incidents of noncompliance in FFY 2012 were corrected within one year and that the programs with noncompliance (1) correctly implemented 34 CFR §§303.209 and 303.344(h) based on a review of updated data through SPR&I, and (2) have conducted a transition conference, although late, 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, consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02.

Improvement Activity 1: ODE will review statewide compliance data, identify barriers to the timely provision of transition conferences, steps and services, and disseminate information to EI/ECSE programs to ensure compliance with this indicator.

Discussion: In FFY 2012, ODE staff reviewed EI transition planning steps, services and timelines with EI/ECSE program personnel attending the annual fall SPR&I trainings. During annual fall SPR&I trainings, programs reviewed requirements for compliance and practices that led to noncompliance. The primary barrier to compliance in this area is the accurate tracking of timelines for transition conferences.

Improvement Activity 2: ODE will work with a select number of EI/ECSE programs whose data show both high and low compliance with this indicator to identify effective practices and barriers to compliance with the provision of timely transition steps and services.

Discussion: During annual fall SPR&I trainings, all programs reviewed barriers and methods for tracking and ensuring effective transition practices. Barriers included miscalculation of timelines. Effective practices included having specific staff assigned to track timelines and schedule reminders to staff throughout the year. Targeted technical assistance on timelines was provided to the programs performing below target.

Improvement Activity 3: ODE will require EI/ECSE programs that are performing below state targets and not demonstrating improvement from the previous year to:

- Review and submit their transition procedures to ODE.
- Revise procedures as needed.
- Provide training to program staff to ensure compliance with timely transition planning.

Discussion: In FFY 2012, one program from FFY 2011 was below the state target for effective transitions and had not demonstrated improvement from the previous year. This program reviewed and submitted transition procedures to ODE and trained staff on C8 timelines and procedures.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2013 (2013-2014):

No revisions.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 9: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

Measurement: Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) programs in Oregon receiving IDEA funds are required to participate in the Oregon Department of Education's (ODE's) System Performance Review & Improvement (SPR&I) web-based application of annual accountability and performance reporting. SPR&I focuses on compliance and performance indicators identified through federal and state regulation. SPR&I provides ODE the mechanism for review of district/ program policies, procedures and practices. Oregon meets the majority of its state agency general supervision requirements through the implementation of the SPR&I monitoring and accountability system.

The following activities are considered standard operating procedure for SPR&I's compliance monitoring:

- **SPR&I annual training:** ODE offers annual fall SPR&I trainings to all programs. Regional training sessions include an overview of the SPR&I annual reporting system, use of and updates to the SPR&I database, and compliance training. Programs are required to send to this annual training, at a minimum, one licensed special education administrator responsible for the supervision of EI/ECSE. In addition, at least one Education Service District (ESD) licensed staff and/or administrator is encouraged to attend in order to build capacity in providing programs within its jurisdiction subsequent technical assistance as needed. Programs are encouraged to send a small team to continue efforts for local capacity building in the areas of procedural compliance.
- **Grant awards:** Small formula grants are awarded to programs annually to assist in completing the required activities of SPR&I. Grant awards extend throughout the year.
- **Procedural compliance review:** Programs conduct individual child file reviews and submit procedural compliance review (PCR) data annually in February. Data are collected on a specified number of child files determined by ODE and are evenly split between Early Intervention and Early Childhood Special Education. This process identifies program noncompliance and documents corrections within individual files, the review of subsequent data for evidence of compliance, and correction of systemic issues when identified. ODE verifies program data in March and notifies programs of compliance status in April.
- **ODE verification:** ODE assigns department personnel (county contacts) to programs to support compliance and corrective action on an ongoing basis. County contacts verify and validate all compliance data submitted by programs. ODE-selected programs submit a subset of their child file review data to ODE for verification.
- **Correction of noncompliance:** All identified noncompliance must be corrected within one year of written notification by ODE. Correction of noncompliance requires programs to verify that services were provided to children, provide explanation of the cause of the noncompliance, correct practices that contributed to the noncompliance, and demonstrate current compliance through subsequent data.

- **Annual determinations:** All programs in Oregon receive annual written notification of their determination status in June.
- **Noncompliance identified through other mechanisms:** Complaints and due process hearings may result in findings of noncompliance. ODE uses independent contractors to conduct complaint investigations, with support, coordination, and additional assistance by ODE legal specialists. When a complaint final order identifies noncompliance and orders corrective action, ODE works with programs to ensure completion of corrective action within required timelines.

ODE has a one-tier due process hearing system. All early intervention 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 works with programs to ensure completion of corrective action within required timelines. ODE uses the same dispute resolution system for Part C as for Part B.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2012 (2012-2013)	100% of findings of noncompliance are corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- 33 findings of noncompliance.
- 33 corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.
 $100\% = [(33) \text{ divided by } (33)] \text{ times } 100.$

INDICATOR C-9 WORKSHEET

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	Number of EIS programs issued findings in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 to 6/30/12)	(a) Number of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 to 6/30/12)	(b) Number of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	3	3	3
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	NA	NA
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	Number of EIS programs issued findings in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 to 6/30/12)	(a) Number of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 to 6/30/12)	(b) Number of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved outcomes	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	1	2	2
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	NA	NA
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	11	16	16
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	NA	NA
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs 6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	NA	NA
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	NA	NA
7. 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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	6	6	6
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	NA	NA
8. 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:	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	2	2	2
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	NA	NA

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	Number of EIS programs issued findings in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 to 6/30/12)	(a) Number of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 to 6/30/12)	(b) Number of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
8. Percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the lead agency has: B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the child resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	NA	NA
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	NA	NA
8. Percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has: 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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	4	4	4
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	NA	NA
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE:	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	NA	NA
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	NA	NA
Sum the numbers down Column (a) and Column (b)			33	33
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100			$33/33 \times 100 =$	100%

Source: SPR&I database, EI/ECSE monthly count database, Dispute Resolution database

Comparison of FFY 2011 through FFY 2012

Year	Monitoring Mechanism	Number of programs monitored	(a) Number of findings of noncompliance	(b) Number of findings from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification	Percent corrected within one year	Current percent corrected
FFY 2011	Self-assessment; on-site visit; dispute resolution	35	38	38	100%	100%
FFY 2012	Self-assessment; on-site visit; dispute resolution	35	33	33	100%	100%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):**Data Summary**

FFY 2012 data indicate a 100% (33/33) correction rate of identified noncompliance from FFY 2011 within one year of identification. ODE had no Part C complaints or due process hearings during 2011-2012, and did not identify any Part C noncompliance through the dispute resolution system or other mechanisms.

Programs were required to bring files into compliance within one year. For noncompliance identified in FFY 2011, in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§ 303.120 and 303.700(d), ODE verified that all districts showed 100% compliance one year after the initial noncompliance was identified based on a review of updated data including data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring and the SPR&I system. Consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02, dated October 17, 2008, each program has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the program.

Improvement Activity 1: ODE will review statewide compliance data, identify areas of noncompliance, and disseminate information to ensure compliance with this indicator.

Discussion: In FFY 2012, ODE provided seven regional EI/ECSE SPR&I trainings. Trainings included a review of state performance on Part C indicators and provided information on correction of noncompliance as per OSEP Memo 09-02. All programs were required to participate and were directed to C9 resources on the ODE website at: <http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/page/?id=2550%20>.

Improvement Activity 2: ODE provides targeted technical assistance to programs through focused monitoring based on the results of a comprehensive review of compliance and performance indicators and annual determination status.

Discussion: In FFY 2012, ODE provided targeted technical assistance through two onsite visits and nine desk audits based on compliance and performance trends of identified programs.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2013 (2013-2014):

No revisions.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/General Supervision

Indicator 12: 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)

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) has adopted Part B hearing procedures for Part C. Under IDEA 2004 Part B, parties to a due process hearing must either participate in a resolution session, agree to waive the resolution session, or agree to mediation in lieu of the resolution session. ODE has developed written guidance and a sample form for documenting resolution session participation and agreements for districts/programs.

ODE provides information about mediation, complaints, and due process hearings to Part C parents in the *Notice of Procedural Safeguards*. ODE has translated the *Notice of Procedural Safeguards* into Spanish, Russian, Vietnamese, and Chinese, and makes it available in alternate formats, upon request. ODE also contracted with Family and Community Together to provide information to parents of infants, toddlers, preschool, and school-age children about procedural safeguards, including information about dispute resolution options.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012 (2012-2013)	Targets and improvement activities will be set if ODE has 10 or more resolution sessions for this indicator.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

N/A = (0 resolutions agreements divided by 0 resolution sessions) times 100.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

ODE had less than ten resolution sessions. No improvement activities are required for this indicator.

Data Summary

No Part C due process hearing requests were submitted to ODE during FFY 2012 or since the beginning of the SPP.

According to the SPP/APR instructions, improvement activities and targets are not required for this indicator.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2013 (2013-2014):

No revisions.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/General Supervision

**Indicator 13: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)**

Measurement: Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) offers mediation to EI/ECSE programs to resolve special education disputes. ODE uses the same dispute resolution system for Part C as for Part B. In FFY 2012, ODE retained eight mediators, all independent contractors, to conduct mediations. ODE provides annual training to the mediation panel on the provisions of the IDEA and application of mediation strategies to special education disputes. ODE also conducts outreach to districts/programs and parents to explain the availability of mediation at no cost to programs or parents before the filing of a complaint or hearing request.

ODE surveys participants immediately following mediation and again six months later about the participant’s satisfaction with the mediation process. Survey results are reviewed by the Dispute Resolution Committee (DRC), a stakeholder group of parents, special educators, a mediator, a parent attorney, a school district attorney, and others. The DRC advises ODE on improvements to the dispute resolution system, including mediation.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012 (2012-2013)	Targets and improvement activities will be set if ODE has 10 or more resolution sessions for this indicator.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

N/A = [(0 mediation agreements related to due process hearings + 0 mediation agreements not related to due process hearings) divided by 0 (total mediations)] times 100.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

Data Summary

No Part C mediation requests were submitted to ODE in FFY 2012.

According to the SPP/APR instructions, improvement activities and targets are not required for this indicator.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2013 (2013-2014):

No revisions.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/General Supervision

Indicator 14: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

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

Measurement: State reported data, including 618 data, State performance plan, and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count and settings, and November 1 for exiting and dispute resolution); and**
- b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement.**

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) manages many statewide data collections designed to meet federal and state reporting requirements, to inform statewide policy development, and to guide practice. ODE stresses accuracy and timeliness in each data collection, in the verification of all data, and in data reporting at both the state and local levels.

All data collections have an ODE staff member designated as the primary owner who provides specific documentation, instruction, and training for the particular data collection. As part of the documentation, all data elements are explained in detail. All data collection timelines are posted online annually. Technical, research, and content specialists are available to assist program staff in reporting valid and reliable data in a timely manner.

Program data providers meet regularly with ODE data owners to discuss data collection policies, procedures, and other issues related to clearly communicating collection requirements. As part of these meetings, changes to the timelines or collections are reviewed to provide proper notice to the data submitters. The importance of submitting timely and accurate data is stressed.

Data collection timelines are set according to data reporting needs, and allow ODE to review the data and submit timely reports. Prior to data collections opening for agency submission, the data systems are thoroughly tested internally to ensure they are functioning properly. Each year the data systems are reviewed internally to revise business rules, as necessary, to accommodate revised reporting requirements or to improve the efficiency of the data collection process.

ODE's data systems collect data electronically from the programs. Agencies are able to submit record files and/or individual records, and are able to edit records individually after they have been submitted. All data submitted through the electronic systems are reviewed upon submission for errors to ensure valid and accurate data are collected.

The data systems include a unique identifier for each child and staff member for whom data are reported in each data collection. These identifiers allow for comparison and reliability checks across data collections. As part of most data collections, reports are provided to programs to review and verify the data they submitted are accurate. ODE analyzes the collected data to ensure they are valid, reliable, and are reported in a timely and accurate manner. Additionally, the Special Education Child Count (SECC) and Exit collections have reports to track the progress of agencies required to submit data. This allows ODE to monitor the collection progress and provide assistance for any agencies that may be struggling with the timely submission of their data.

The Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Performance Plan (SPP) are populated with data gathered from ODE's electronic data collections and additional data from monitoring databases, the dispute resolution database, and parent surveys.

A variety of public agencies, including Early Intervention (EI) programs, provide the data reported in this indicator. For FFY 2012, the number (n) of required reporting agencies varied for each collection listed below.

Special Education Child Count (SECC) and Exit data are reported by 23 reporting agencies serving children age birth through two in Early Intervention (EI).

- EI contractors and subcontractors..... n = 23

Systems Performance Review & Improvement (SPR&I) data are reported by a total of 35 EI programs serving children with disabilities on the previous December 1st.

- EI programs n = 35*

*There are 23 EI contractors and subcontractors that operate a total of 35 EI programs. SPR&I data collection and analysis are by program.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012 (2012-2013)	100% of state-reported data, including 618 data, State Performance Plan, and Annual Performance Reports will be accurate and submitted to OSEP on or before the due date.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

Part C Indicator 14 Data Rubric

Indicator 14 - SPP/APR Data			
APR Indicator	Valid and reliable	Correct calculation	Total
1	1	1	2
2	1	1	2
3	1	1	2
4	1	1	2
5	1	1	2
6	1	1	2
7	1	1	2
8A	1	1	2
8B	1	1	2
8C	1	1	2
9	1	1	2
12	1	1	2
13	1	1	2
		Subtotal	26
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points – If the FFY 2012 APR was submitted on time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.		5
	Grand Total - (sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =		31

Note: "1" equals "yes."

Indicator 14 - 618 Data					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Date Note Requests	Total
Table 1 – Child Count Due Date: 2/6/13	1	1	1	1	4
Table 2 – Settings Due Date: 2/6/13	1	1	1	1	4
Table 3 – Exiting Due Date: 11/6/13	1	1	1	N/A	3

Indicator 14 - 618 Data					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Date Note Requests	Total
Table 4 – Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/6/13	1	1	1	N/A	3
				Subtotal	14
			Weighted Total (subtotal X 2.2)		30.8
Indicator # 14 Calculation					
A. APR Grand Total					31.00
B. 618 Grand Total					30.80
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =					61.80
					Total NA in APR
					0.00
					Total NA in 618
					0.00
					Base
					63.80
D. Subtotal (C divided by Base**) =					1.00
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =					100.00

Notes: "1" equals "yes;" any cell marked as N/A will decrease the denominator by 1 for APR, and by 2.2 for 618

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

Data Summary

The target for this indicator was met. Oregon submitted 100% of the required data for FFY 2012 on or before the due date. All SPP/APR data were from the correct time period and consistent with the indicator measurement, IDEA 618 data submissions (when appropriate), and the indicator data from previous years (unless explained). IDEA 618 data were complete and passed all internal edit checks. ODE responded to all data note requests.

Improvement Activity 1: ODE will review statewide data submissions to identify barriers to timeliness and accuracy, and disseminate information to ensure timely and accurate submission of valid and reliable data.

Discussion: In FFY 2012, ODE reviewed statewide data submissions for timeliness and accuracy. ODE provided annual web-based training for all collections, seven regional trainings for the SECC collection and two new LEA/program staff trainings for the SECC and Exiting collections, where identified barriers to timeliness and accuracy were addressed. ODE continued to provide specific instructions and timelines for all collections.

Improvement Activity 2: Provide targeted technical assistance to selected programs in an effort to enhance the timely and accurate submission of data.

Discussion: In FFY 2012, ODE provided timeliness and accuracy status to each program by data collection. ODE provided annual web-based training for all collections, seven regional trainings for the SECC collection and two new LEA/program staff trainings for the SECC and Exiting collections in an effort to enhance the timely and accurate submission of data. To provide targeted technical assistance, ODE reviewed program data collection and reporting processes to ensure the program’s methods adequately address and ensure error-free, consistent, and valid and reliable data can be reported in a timely manner.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2013 (2013-2014):

No Revisions.