

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART C

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2019**

Texas



**PART C DUE
February 1, 2021**

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

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

The Data, Analysis, and Reporting section of the Early Childhood Intervention Part C system within the Health, Developmental and Independence Services Department at the Texas Health and Human Services Commission gathered and analyzed data for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2019 Annual Performance Report (APR) for the Texas Early Childhood Intervention (ECI) Part C system. The APR draft, along with actual data, targets and activities, was presented to the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), the ECI Advisory Committee, on January 13, 2021. The SICC assisted Texas Part C in examining data as well as FFY 2019 targets and activities. During the meeting, this council provided input and recommendations for improvement.

In the determination letter released by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on June 23, 2020, Texas Part C was notified that the Department of Education had determined that, under IDEA sections 616(d) (2)(A)(i) and 642, Texas provides valid and reliable data reflecting the measurement for each indicator and 100% correction of previously identified findings of noncompliance for Indicators 1, 7 and 8 in the FFY 2018 APR and revised State Performance Plan (SPP) for each year through FFY 2019.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

General Supervision System

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

Texas' Part C system is administered by the Health and Human Services Commission. Texas' supervision of the state system involves many avenues of monitoring and improvement. The performance of contracted agencies is reviewed through analysis of a large number of functions, criteria, and factors, using both state criteria and national standards. Analysis is conducted on a monthly, quarterly, and annual basis using data in the Texas Kids Intervention Data System (TKIDS), the online application used for submission of client data to the state. The TKIDS Reporting and Data (TRAD) system provides 33 different reports that aggregate data around functions of the ECI system for individual programs and 1 internal report listing average delivered hours per program for use by the ECI state office.

ECI monitors contracted agency performance on contract terms and conditions, including contract amendments; program rules, policies, and procedures; other requested contractor reporting; identified areas of associated risk; and any issues that require special attention and monitoring as determined by ECI. Depending on the analysis of the data, performance management activities may include desk reviews of provider data, policies, and consumer records, as well as on-site visits and other activities determined necessary.

The systematic, ongoing, on-site monitoring of contractor compliance and finance is performed by a team of highly qualified experts in these procedures. The team identifies areas of noncompliance and ensures necessary corrective actions are implemented. The team verifies the accuracy of data reports and provides evaluation of functions that are not covered by data analysis. ECI conducts quality assurance reviews based on a risk assessment. This process involves clinical and analytical expertise by ECI quality assurance therapists and quality assurance specialists, with a primary focus on providing assistance to contractors on eligibility determination, IFSP service planning and outcomes, the delivery of therapy services and specialized skills training, as well as promoting quality and reliable outcomes data reporting. Results are communicated to the programs both informally and by written report. Complaints are received through the ECI family liaison or through the HHS Office of the Ombudsman. ECI uses three formal processes for resolving complaints or disputes: filing a formal, written complaint to ECI; mediation; or requesting an administrative due process hearing. Formal complaints are received by the ECI Director. ECI completes an investigation and provides a resolution within 60 days from the date the complaint was received. If a complainant chooses to pursue mediation, both parties must agree to participate. A neutral mediator is assigned at ECI's expense to try to reach a resolution. An administrative due process hearing is a more formal process than filing a formal complaint or requesting mediation. A hearing officer makes a decision within 30 days from the date the request for the hearing was filed. A complainant has the right to access any and all of these options when trying to resolve a disagreement about a child's services or any aspect of the ECI system believed to violate legal requirements. The Executive Commissioner is provided with a monthly report detailing information on ECI and other complaint trends.

Section 618 of IDEA requires that each state submit data about the infants and toddlers, birth through age 2, who receive early intervention services under Part C of IDEA. Annually, ECI uses 618 data, APR indicators, local reports and monitoring reports from onsite monitoring visits every five years to assist in evaluating compliance and performance of each contractor. These data are considered in final program determinations and are used to communicate overall contractor strengths and weaknesses, resulting in recommendations for improvements. In addition, local reports, determination reports, family outcomes surveys, and child outcomes data are used to identify opportunities for improvement or recognition for excellent performance.

Technical Assistance System:

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

The technical assistance system includes supports that the ECI State Office has in place to offer timely delivery of information and resources to early intervention contractors in Texas. Most webinars are archived so direct service providers and other contract staff who cannot participate during the "live" webinar can access the information when it is convenient for them. The use of technology to deliver technical assistance allows ECI to provide consistent information to all staff at any time. General information about ECI, data, reports, webinars and training modules are available to all staff at the contracting programs and the general public through the ECI website. ECI offers technical assistance and professional development through interactive web-based modules, webinars from various partners, videos, written documents and publications. In addition, individualized technical assistance is provided to contractor leadership based on compliance or quality issues identified during compliance monitoring, quality assurance visits, and analysis of information entered by contractors into the statewide data system.

Professional Development System:

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

ECI provides professional personnel development to contractors across the state to comply with the IDEA Part C requirement that a state system must include a Comprehensive System of Personnel Development. ECI state office staff have expertise in principles of adult learning strategies; development, implementation and evaluation of training; and methodologies for developing and disseminating information/content both in person and via web-based training. State office subject matter experts in early intervention (i.e., IDEA Part C, quality practices in early intervention, Medicaid, interagency collaborations, fiscal requirements, third party reimbursement, policy, etc.) collaborate on content for professional development and technical assistance products. Professional development needs are identified through a variety of methods including review of individual program and statewide data,

information from compliance monitoring and quality assurance reviews, new research and current evidence-based practices and initiatives in early intervention, input from contractor program directors and supervisors, results from training surveys, and national and state level policy changes. All professional personnel development provided by ECI is offered at no cost to the contractors. Additionally, contracting agencies use contract funds to pay for professional development opportunities not offered by the state office. ECI professional personnel development is offered to contractors through a variety of formats including: interactive online training modules, webinars, videos, written documents, the central directory of resources, workbooks, the ECI library materials, and training packages that include materials and activities for contractor staff to complete individually or as a group. ECI technical assistance materials are available for contractors, community partners and families.

Stakeholder Involvement:

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

ECI develops the Texas Part C APR with direction from the SICC, the ECI Advisory Committee. Stakeholders are involved in the review of data and improvement activities for all indicators. They also provide input into the targets. ECI state staff prepared a written draft of the APR that was disseminated to members of the ECI Advisory Committee. During their meeting held on January 13, 2021, the SICC members reviewed the draft and data, and provided comments that have been addressed throughout this report. For the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) specifically, stakeholders were identified in FFY 2014 and include members of the SICC, parents, agency representatives, advocacy groups, early childhood and prevention professionals, therapists and physicians. Texas ECI stakeholders identified improvement activities and developed an evaluation plan for improving social-emotional outcomes for children and families as a focus area. Stakeholders continue to participate in learning collaboratives, face-to-face meetings, webinars, conference calls, electronic communications, and inter-agency meetings to provide input, expertise and specific community needs and resources relevant to the SSIP.

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

YES

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2018 performance of each EIS Program located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2018 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2018 APR in 2020, is available.

To inform the public about Texas Early Childhood Intervention, ECI publishes the data and reports described below every year at

<https://hhs.texas.gov/doing-business-hhs/provider-portals/assistive-services-providers/early-childhood-intervention-programs/data-reports/eci-local-program-performance-reports>

The APR is published no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its report.

ECI Consumer Profile:

Describes various characteristics of the children and families served by the ECI program in the most recent fiscal year.

ECI Served by County:

Presents the number of children served by the ECI program in the most recent fiscal year, statewide and by each county. Also provides the number of children served as a percentage of the birth-to-three population.

Part C Annual Performance Report:

Describes progress in meeting the targets established in the State Performance Plan and includes the State Systemic Improvement Plan.

ECI Local Program Performance Reports:

The performance of each local ECI program is reported on a number of indicators from the Annual Performance Report.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

OSEP notes that one or more of the attachments included in the State's FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

Intro - OSEP Response

The State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) submitted to the Secretary its annual report that is required under IDEA section 641(e)(1)(D) and 34 C.F.R. §303.604(c). The SICC noted it has elected to support the State lead agency's submission of its SPP/APR as its annual report in lieu of submitting a separate report. OSEP accepts the SICC form, which will not be posted publicly with the State's SPP/APR documents.

OSEP issued a monitoring report to the State on October 5, 2020 and is currently reviewing the State's response submitted on February 3, 2021 and will respond under separate cover.

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	82.70%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	95.01%	96.34%	95.61%	95.88%	95.76%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
8,636	10,068	95.76%	100%	96.01%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

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

1,030

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

Early Childhood Intervention services needed by the child must be initiated in a timely manner and delivered as planned in the IFSP. Texas defines "timely" as the percentage of children with IFSPs who received planned services with a start date within 28 days of the family signing the IFSP.

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

State database

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

All records were from infants and toddlers enrolled before or during the period of September 1, 2019 through November 30, 2019 and the initiation of new early intervention services from initial IFSPs or subsequent IFSPs.

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

The data reflects all infants and toddlers with new early intervention services from IFSPs between September 1, 2019 through November 30, 2019 (the first quarter of the state fiscal year 2020). This data reflects stable enrollment trends; it is considered representative of the entire year's data and the full reporting period. All ECI programs are reviewed to ensure all required IFSP data was entered into the state database (TKIDS) during the state fiscal year for all eligible infants and toddlers.

If needed, provide additional information about this indicator here.

ECI services were required to begin no later than 28 days from the date the parent provided the written consent, as shown on the IFSP. The start date of the service is a required field in the TKIDS database. If the services were not provided in a timely manner, due to either exceptional circumstances or other reasons, this information was documented in the child record in the database. Documented exceptional family circumstances are included in the numerator and denominator for calculating the actual data target.

Actual Data for FFY 2019 include:

1. Total children reviewed from all ECI programs: 10,068
2. Children with IFSPs receiving early intervention services in a timely manner (begin on or before 28 days with the parent's consent): 8,636
3. Children with IFSPs who received services late, due to documented exceptional circumstances, such as child or family illness, hospitalization of the child or another family member, or other family circumstances and other exceptional circumstances such as natural disasters or extreme weather-related conditions: 1,030
4. Children with IFSPs not receiving timely services delivery for other reasons such as staff shortage, staff illness, scheduling difficulties, unclear documentation: 402

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
33	33	0	0

FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In compliance with OSEP Memo 09-02, ECI examines data from TKIDS at least one time per year to determine noncompliance with the requirements for timely service initiation (within 28 days of development of the IFSP). ECI provides a list of the potentially noncompliant cases to each ECI contractor and gives them the opportunity to review the data for accuracy and provide additional evidence that demonstrates compliance. Once the data is confirmed, ECI identifies cases that are, in fact, noncompliant. ECI issues findings based on the noncompliant cases. ECI identified 33 programs that were noncompliant. After this, performance specialists reviewed subsequent data through data monitoring for each ECI program to verify that the 33 ECI programs correctly implemented the specified regulatory requirements. Through this process, Texas Part C confirmed 100% correction of the cases in the 33 programs. The corrections were verified based on either onsite record review or a sample of data in the TKIDS database for IFSPs that were developed within one year from identification of the finding.

Correction of System Findings

ECI ensures correction of a system finding by pulling a reasonable subsequent sample of data. System findings are cleared when the data indicates zero non-compliant cases and must be cleared within one year of the issuance of the finding.

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

In compliance with OSEP Memo 09-02, ECI examines data from TKIDS at least one time per year to determine noncompliance with the requirements for timely service initiation (within 28 days of development of the IFSP) for each individual case.

Correction of Individual Child Findings

ECI ensures correction of individual child findings by verifying the correction within one year of the issuance of the finding. Corrective action is required unless the child is no longer in the jurisdiction of the ECI program.

Addressing Continued Noncompliance

If an ECI contractor is unable to clear a child and/or system finding within one year of the issuance of the finding and demonstrates continued

noncompliance with a lack of significant improvement, ECI may take remedial additional action, up to and including contract termination. This also negatively impacts the ECI contractor's annual determination.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2019-June 30, 2020). The State described how the time period in which the data were collected accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

1 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	98.50%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target>=	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%
Data	99.50%	99.58%	99.29%	99.26%	99.28%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target>=	99.20%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ECI develops the Texas Part C APR with direction from the SICC, the ECI Advisory Committee. Stakeholders are involved in the review of data and improvement activities for all indicators. They also provide input into the targets. ECI state staff prepared a written draft of the APR that was disseminated to members of the ECI Advisory Committee. During their meeting held on January 13, 2021, the SICC members reviewed the draft and data, and provided comments that have been addressed throughout this report. For the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) specifically, stakeholders were identified in FFY 2014 and include members of the SICC, parents, agency representatives, advocacy groups, early childhood and prevention professionals, therapists and physicians. Texas ECI stakeholders identified improvement activities and developed an evaluation plan for improving social-emotional outcomes for children and families as a focus area. Stakeholders continue to participate in learning collaboratives, face-to-face meetings, webinars, conference calls, electronic communications, and inter-agency meetings to provide input, expertise and specific community needs and resources relevant to the SSIP.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/08/2020	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	28,951
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/08/2020	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	29,227

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of Infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
28,951	29,227	99.28%	99.20%	99.06%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

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

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

Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3 - Indicator Data

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ECI develops the Texas Part C APR with direction from the SICC, the ECI Advisory Committee. Stakeholders are involved in the review of data and improvement activities for all indicators. They also provide input into the targets. ECI state staff prepared a written draft of the APR that was disseminated to members of the ECI Advisory Committee. During their meeting held on January 13, 2021, the SICC members reviewed the draft and data, and provided comments that have been addressed throughout this report. For the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) specifically, stakeholders were identified in FFY 2014 and include members of the SICC, parents, agency representatives, advocacy groups, early childhood and prevention professionals, therapists and physicians. Texas ECI stakeholders identified improvement activities and developed an evaluation plan for improving social-emotional outcomes for children and families as a focus area. Stakeholders continue to participate in learning collaboratives, face-to-face meetings, webinars, conference calls, electronic communications, and inter-agency meetings to provide input, expertise and specific community needs and resources relevant to the SSIP.

Historical Data

Outcome	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A1	2013	Target>=	71.00%	71.20%	71.40%	71.60%	71.80%
A1	71.31%	Data	71.77%	71.90%	72.30%	72.28%	71.74%
A2	2013	Target>=	53.80%	53.90%	54.10%	54.30%	54.40%
A2	53.67%	Data	53.76%	52.88%	52.40%	48.71%	49.33%
B1	2013	Target>=	77.10%	77.20%	77.30%	77.40%	77.50%
B1	77.35%	Data	77.69%	77.94%	78.55%	78.42%	78.19%
B2	2013	Target>=	45.10%	45.15%	45.20%	45.30%	45.40%
B2	45.00%	Data	44.33%	42.40%	42.23%	39.27%	38.01%
C1	2013	Target>=	77.40%	77.50%	77.60%	77.70%	77.80%
C1	77.65%	Data	78.11%	79.85%	80.43%	80.35%	79.53%
C2	2013	Target>=	51.50%	51.60%	51.65%	51.70%	51.80%
C2	51.39%	Data	51.27%	51.21%	49.88%	47.79%	47.42%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A1>=	71.72%
Target A2>=	53.69%
Target B1>=	78.22%
Target B2>=	45.02%
Target C1>=	79.52%
Target C2>=	51.41%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

21,941

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	68	0.31%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	5,673	25.86%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	6,043	27.54%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	7,036	32.07%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,121	14.22%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	13,079	18,820	71.74%	71.72%	69.50%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	10,157	21,941	49.33%	53.69%	46.29%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable

COVID-19 has impacted the number of children who exited from the Texas Part C program. There was a 5.2% decrease in exits when compared to the percentage of children who exited in FFY 2018 and FFY 2019. The decline in exits may be due to the less frequent services in the 3rd quarter and to some extent in the 4th quarter, which may have impacted a child's progress, preventing a child from exiting. Also, among the exited children, there was a 3% decrease in the number of children who had completed IFSPs, which correlates with a 3% increase in the number of families who could not be contacted. The above stated reasons lead to Texas not meeting the target for each summary statement in each outcome category.

ECl continues to focus its efforts on improving the quality of the data that is used for this outcome. The state office relies on management reports that show whether data are collected and reported as required; contractors have access to two different reports that indicate whether data are complete as required at entry and exit; and detail and aggregate reports display actual results for entry ratings, progress data and summary statements. The quality assurance team reviews the accuracy of the entry and exit outcome ratings over a period of time. Technical assistance has been provided in addition to the online training modules, particularly with regard to how to assign realistic, accurate ratings of children in the ECl program compared to their same-age peers, including a new webinar released in September 2020 to educate ECl providers in making connections between the information gathered during the referral, intake, evaluation, and IFSP processes and using that information to accurately document functioning and coding for each of the child's daily routines and assign Global Child Outcome ratings that align with the information and codes in the IFSP, as well as the rest of the child's record. This training and technical assistance may have resulted in more accurate but less positive outcome ratings. These changes may have additionally contributed to the fluctuation in percentages of summary statement 1 and 2.

Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable

COVID-19 has impacted the number of children who exited from the Texas Part C program. There was a 5.2% decrease in exits when compared to the percentage of children who exited in FFY 2018 and FFY 2019. The decline in exits may be due to the less frequent services in the 3rd quarter and to some extent in the 4th quarter, which may have impacted a child's progress, preventing a child from exiting. Also, among the exited children, there was a 3% decrease in the number of children who had completed IFSPs, which correlates with a 3% increase in the number of families who could not be contacted. The above stated reasons lead to Texas not meeting the target for each summary statement in each outcome category.

ECl continues to focus its efforts on improving the quality of the data that is used for this outcome. The state office relies on management reports that show whether data are collected and reported as required; contractors have access to two different reports that indicate whether data are complete as required at entry and exit; and detail and aggregate reports display actual results for entry ratings, progress data and summary statements. The quality assurance team reviews the accuracy of the entry and exit outcome ratings over a period of time. Technical assistance has been provided in addition to the online training modules, particularly with regard to how to assign realistic, accurate ratings of children in the ECl program compared to their same-age peers, including a new webinar released in September 2020 to educate ECl providers in making connections between the information gathered during the referral, intake, evaluation, and IFSP processes and using that information to accurately document functioning and coding for each of the child's daily routines and assign Global Child Outcome ratings that align with the information and codes in the IFSP, as well as the rest of the child's record. This training and technical assistance may have resulted in more accurate but less positive outcome ratings. These changes may have additionally contributed to the fluctuation in percentages of summary statement 1 and 2.

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	54	0.25%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	4,804	21.90%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	9,337	42.56%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	7,016	31.98%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	730	3.33%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	16,353	21,211	78.19%	78.22%	77.10%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	7,746	21,941	38.01%	45.02%	35.30%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable

COVID-19 has impacted the number of children who exited from the Texas Part C program. There was a 5.2% decrease in exits when compared to the percentage of children who exited in FFY 2018 and FFY 2019. The decline in exits may be due to the less frequent services in the 3rd quarter and to some extent in the 4th quarter, which may have impacted a child's progress, preventing a child from exiting. Also, among the exited children, there was a 3% decrease in the number of children who had completed IFSPs, which correlates with a 3% increase in the number of families who could not be contacted. The above stated reasons lead to Texas not meeting the target for each summary statement in each outcome category.

ECl continues to focus its efforts on improving the quality of the data that is used for this outcome. The state office relies on management reports that show whether data are collected and reported as required; contractors have access to two different reports that indicate whether data are complete as required at entry and exit; and detail and aggregate reports display actual results for entry ratings, progress data and summary statements. The quality assurance team reviews the accuracy of the entry and exit outcome ratings over a period of time. Technical assistance has been provided in addition to the online training modules, particularly with regard to how to assign realistic, accurate ratings of children in the ECl program compared to their same-age peers, including a new webinar released in September 2020 to educate ECl providers in making connections between the information gathered during the referral, intake, evaluation, and IFSP processes and using that information to accurately document functioning and coding for each of the child's daily routines and assign Global Child Outcome ratings that align with the information and codes in the IFSP, as well as the rest of the child's record. This training and technical assistance may have resulted in more accurate but less positive outcome ratings. These changes may have additionally contributed to the fluctuation in percentages of summary statement 1 and 2.

Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable

COVID-19 has impacted the number of children who exited from the Texas Part C program. There was a 5.2% decrease in exits when compared to the percentage of children who exited in FFY 2018 and FFY 2019. The decline in exits may be due to the less frequent services in the 3rd quarter and to some extent in the 4th quarter, which may have impacted a child's progress, preventing a child from exiting. Also, among the exited children, there was a 3% decrease in the number of children who had completed IFSPs, which correlates with a 3% increase in the number of families who could not be contacted. The above stated reasons lead to Texas not meeting the target for each summary statement in each outcome category.

ECl continues to focus its efforts on improving the quality of the data that is used for this outcome. The state office relies on management reports that show whether data are collected and reported as required; contractors have access to two different reports that indicate whether data are complete as required at entry and exit; and detail and aggregate reports display actual results for entry ratings, progress data and summary statements. The quality assurance team reviews the accuracy of the entry and exit outcome ratings over a period of time. Technical assistance has been provided in addition to the online training modules, particularly with regard to how to assign realistic, accurate ratings of children in the ECl program compared to their same-age peers, including a new webinar released in September 2020 to educate ECl providers in making connections between the information gathered during the referral, intake, evaluation, and IFSP processes and using that information to accurately document functioning and coding for each of the child's daily routines and assign Global Child Outcome ratings that align with the information and codes in the IFSP, as well as the rest of the child's record. This training and technical assistance may have resulted in more accurate but less positive outcome ratings. These changes may have additionally contributed to the fluctuation in percentages of summary statement 1 and 2.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	53	0.24%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	4,635	21.12%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	7,570	34.50%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	8,536	38.90%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,147	5.23%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in	16,106	20,794	79.53%	79.52%	77.46%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program							
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	9,683	21,941	47.42%	51.41%	44.13%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable

COVID-19 has impacted the number of children who exited from the Texas Part C program. There was a 5.2% decrease in exits when compared to the percentage of children who exited in FFY 2018 and FFY 2019. The decline in exits may be due to the less frequent services in the 3rd quarter and to some extent in the 4th quarter, which may have impacted a child's progress, preventing a child from exiting. Also, among the exited children, there was a 3% decrease in the number of children who had completed IFSPs, which correlates with a 3% increase in the number of families who could not be contacted. The above stated reasons lead to Texas not meeting the target for each summary statement in each outcome category.

ECl continues to focus its efforts on improving the quality of the data that is used for this outcome. The state office relies on management reports that show whether data are collected and reported as required; contractors have access to two different reports that indicate whether data are complete as required at entry and exit; and detail and aggregate reports display actual results for entry ratings, progress data and summary statements. The quality assurance team reviews the accuracy of the entry and exit outcome ratings over a period of time. Technical assistance has been provided in addition to the online training modules, particularly with regard to how to assign realistic, accurate ratings of children in the ECl program compared to their same-age peers, including a new webinar released in September 2020 to educate ECl providers in making connections between the information gathered during the referral, intake, evaluation, and IFSP processes and using that information to accurately document functioning and coding for each of the child's daily routines and assign Global Child Outcome ratings that align with the information and codes in the IFSP, as well as the rest of the child's record. This training and technical assistance may have resulted in more accurate but less positive outcome ratings. These changes may have additionally contributed to the fluctuation in percentages of summary statement 1 and 2.

Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable

COVID-19 has impacted the number of children who exited from the Texas Part C program. There was a 5.2% decrease in exits when compared to the percentage of children who exited in FFY 2018 and FFY 2019. The decline in exits may be due to the less frequent services in the 3rd quarter and to some extent in the 4th quarter, which may have impacted a child's progress, preventing a child from exiting. Also, among the exited children, there was a 3% decrease in the number of children who had completed IFSPs, which correlates with a 3% increase in the number of families who could not be contacted. The above stated reasons lead to Texas not meeting the target for each summary statement in each outcome category.

ECl continues to focus its efforts on improving the quality of the data that is used for this outcome. The state office relies on management reports that show whether data are collected and reported as required; contractors have access to two different reports that indicate whether data are complete as required at entry and exit; and detail and aggregate reports display actual results for entry ratings, progress data and summary statements. The quality assurance team reviews the accuracy of the entry and exit outcome ratings over a period of time. Technical assistance has been provided in addition to the online training modules, particularly with regard to how to assign realistic, accurate ratings of children in the ECl program compared to their same-age peers, including a new webinar released in September 2020 to educate ECl providers in making connections between the information gathered during the referral, intake, evaluation, and IFSP processes and using that information to accurately document functioning and coding for each of the child's daily routines and assign Global Child Outcome ratings that align with the information and codes in the IFSP, as well as the rest of the child's record. This training and technical assistance may have resulted in more accurate but less positive outcome ratings. These changes may have additionally contributed to the fluctuation in percentages of summary statement 1 and 2.

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

Question	Number
The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's part C exiting 618 data	29,227
The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.	7,829

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

The child's team assigns ratings based on information gathered throughout the evaluation and needs assessment process. The Battelle Developmental Inventory 2nd edition is used to determine eligibility for children who don't have a qualifying diagnosis. The child's extent of delay on the BDI-2 is only one factor in assigning ratings. Another factor in determining ratings is clinical assessment by team members. In some cases, the team may use an additional instrument to look more closely at specific developmental concerns, or the team may choose to assess these concerns without a specific protocol. Finally, the ECl team has a discussion with the parents about the child's functional strengths and needs within the context of daily routines and

activities. The team uses all of these processes (BDI-2 when appropriate, clinical assessment, family discussion about functioning in routines) to arrive at the Global Child Outcomes ratings.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

ECl continues to focus its efforts on improving the quality of the data that is used for this outcome. The state office relies on management reports that show whether data are collected and reported as required; contractors have access to two different reports that indicate whether data are complete as required at entry and exit; and detail and aggregate reports display actual results for entry ratings, progress data and summary statements. The quality assurance team reviews the accuracy of the entry and exit outcome ratings over a period of time. Technical assistance has been provided in addition to the online training modules, particularly with regard to how to assign realistic, accurate ratings of children in the ECl program compared to their same-age peers, including a new webinar released in September 2020 to educate ECl providers in making connections between the information gathered during the referral, intake, evaluation, and IFSP processes and using that information to accurately document functioning and coding for each of the child's daily routines and assign Global Child Outcome ratings that align with the information and codes in the IFSP, as well as the rest of the child's record. This training and technical assistance may have resulted in more accurate but less positive outcome ratings. These changes may have additionally contributed to the fluctuation in percentages of summary statement 1 and 2.

3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3 - OSEP Response

3 - Required Actions

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

4 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2013	Target>=	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%
A	86.57%	Data	87.48%	86.40%	88.84%	87.91%	86.58%
B	2013	Target>=	87.70%	87.70%	87.70%	87.70%	88.00%
B	87.71%	Data	88.22%	87.41%	90.18%	88.75%	88.16%
C	2013	Target>=	87.80%	87.80%	87.80%	87.80%	88.00%
C	87.79%	Data	88.70%	87.41%	88.59%	89.98%	88.94%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A>=	87.00%
Target B>=	88.00%
Target C>=	88.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ECI develops the Texas Part C APR with direction from the SICC, the ECI Advisory Committee. Stakeholders are involved in the review of data and improvement activities for all indicators. They also provide input into the targets. ECI state staff prepared a written draft of the APR that was

disseminated to members of the ECI Advisory Committee. During their meeting held on January 13, 2021, the SICC members reviewed the draft and data, and provided comments that have been addressed throughout this report. For the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) specifically, stakeholders were identified in FFY 2014 and include members of the SICC, parents, agency representatives, advocacy groups, early childhood and prevention professionals, therapists and physicians. Texas ECI stakeholders identified improvement activities and developed an evaluation plan for improving social-emotional outcomes for children and families as a focus area. Stakeholders continue to participate in learning collaboratives, face-to-face meetings, webinars, conference calls, electronic communications, and inter-agency meetings to provide input, expertise and specific community needs and resources relevant to the SSIP.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	5,304
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	2,685
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	2,201
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	2,587
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	2,276
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	2,585
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	2,278
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	2,584

Measure	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2)	86.58%	87.00%	85.08%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2)	88.16%	88.00%	88.05%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2)	88.94%	88.00%	88.16%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for part A slippage, if applicable

There was a 1.92% decrease in FFY 2019 data when compared to the FFY 2019 target. ECI's policy requires contractors to provide all families with the ECI Parent Handbook that informs parents of their rights under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). The handbook is reviewed on a routine basis and updated as needed. The ECI Parent Handbook must be explained to parents at the beginning of the intake process, reviewed at the initial IFSP meeting before requesting that the parent sign the IFSP, and reviewed annually at the time of the annual meeting held to evaluate the IFSP. Through webinars, the State office informs contractors to encourage parents to read the handbook to understand the program, which in turn may help families to help understand and record responses for the survey questions.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	NO

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

A stratified random sampling plan with 95% confidence level was used to select a sample for FFY19. All programs were stratified with respect to geographic region and size (large versus medium/small). Families were selected from each of the seven geographic regions to ensure statewide representation. A sample of families whose infant(s) and/or toddler(s) had been enrolled for at least six months as of June 1, 2020 was selected from each of the 43 programs. The number of families who received the survey was proportionate to the size of the program. Use of proportionate distribution of the surveys helped ensure a representative sample.

Texas Part C input the Family Outcomes Survey-Revised (FOS-R) into a website. The survey period was from June 2020 until July 2020. During this period, families received their surveys electronically or during telehealth visits. After the survey period ended, the state office accessed the survey responses that families submitted electronically. Completed survey responses were only accessible to the state office to ensure confidentiality. A total of 6,251 families were randomly selected to respond to the survey; 947 were undeliverable, due to family discharging from ECI, staff member unable to reach a family, child hospitalizations, family moving, etc. A total of 5,304 families received it; 2,685 returned the survey. This resulted in 50.6% of sampled families responding to the family outcomes survey.

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

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

A multi-stage stratified random sampling plan was used to select the survey sample. Use of proportionate distribution of the surveys helped ensure a representative sample. Analyses of the survey sample showed that the sample was representative of race , ethnicity, gender, age at enrollment and primary language. Similarly, many variables were used in analyzing the data of the respondent families. The results of the analyses were compared to the demographics of FFY 2019 ECI statewide served population available in the FFY 2019 ECI Consumer Profile report. Analyses indicated that respondents were representative of the statewide population of families in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, age at enrollment, and primary language. For eligibility type, the proportion of the respondent families with eligibility type "Medical Diagnosis" was eight percent higher when compared to statewide served "Medical Diagnosis" percentage. The proportion of the respondent families with eligibility type "Developmental Delay" was ten percent lower when compared to statewide served "Developmental Delay" percentage. The initial survey sample sent was representative in terms of eligibility types.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State office is working with ECTA on a two-year technical assistance project to improve family outcomes data.

4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4 - OSEP Response

4 - Required Actions

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	0.82%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	0.99%	0.99%	0.99%	0.99%	0.99%
Data	0.99%	0.94%	1.05%	1.01%	1.09%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	1.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ECI develops the Texas Part C APR with direction from the SICC, the ECI Advisory Committee. Stakeholders are involved in the review of data and improvement activities for all indicators. They also provide input into the targets. ECI state staff prepared a written draft of the APR that was disseminated to members of the ECI Advisory Committee. During their meeting held on January 13, 2021, the SICC members reviewed the draft and data, and provided comments that have been addressed throughout this report. For the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) specifically, stakeholders were identified in FFY 2014 and include members of the SICC, parents, agency representatives, advocacy groups, early childhood and prevention professionals, therapists and physicians. Texas ECI stakeholders identified improvement activities and developed an evaluation plan for improving social-emotional outcomes for children and families as a focus area. Stakeholders continue to participate in learning collaboratives, face-to-face meetings, webinars, conference calls, electronic communications, and inter-agency meetings to provide input, expertise and specific community needs and resources relevant to the SSIP.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/08/2020	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	4,399
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/25/2020	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	377,806

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
4,399	377,806	1.09%	1.00%	1.16%	Met Target	No Slippage

Compare your results to the national data

Texas exceeded its target of 1.00% for the percent of the birth-to-one population with IFSPs and showed an increase of .07% when compared to FFY2019 data. The national mean for this indicator is 1.37. Texas is 0.21% less than the national mean and is within one percentage point of the national mean. The number of newly enrolled children for this fiscal year showed an increase of 5 percent when compared to FFY2018. Also, from FFY

2018 to FFY 2019, Texas saw a 2.8% increase from the referral to the newly enrolled population. Thus, the percentage of the population with IFSPs continues to increase.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	1.93%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	1.98%	1.99%	2.00%	2.01%	2.01%
Data	2.05%	2.04%	2.11%	2.14%	2.34%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	2.02%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ECI develops the Texas Part C APR with direction from the SICC, the ECI Advisory Committee. Stakeholders are involved in the review of data and improvement activities for all indicators. They also provide input into the targets. ECI state staff prepared a written draft of the APR that was disseminated to members of the ECI Advisory Committee. During their meeting held on January 13, 2021, the SICC members reviewed the draft and data, and provided comments that have been addressed throughout this report. For the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) specifically, stakeholders were identified in FFY 2014 and include members of the SICC, parents, agency representatives, advocacy groups, early childhood and prevention professionals, therapists and physicians. Texas ECI stakeholders identified improvement activities and developed an evaluation plan for improving social-emotional outcomes for children and families as a focus area. Stakeholders continue to participate in learning collaboratives, face-to-face meetings, webinars, conference calls, electronic communications, and inter-agency meetings to provide input, expertise and specific community needs and resources relevant to the SSIP.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/08/2020	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	29,227
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/25/2020	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	1,160,963

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
29,227	1,160,963	2.34%	2.02%	2.52%	Met Target	No Slippage

Compare your results to the national data

Texas exceeded its target of 2.02% for the percent of the birth-to-three population with IFSPs, and improved its performance by 0.18% compared to FFY2018. The national mean for this indicator is 3.70%. Texas is about one percentage less than the national mean. The number of newly enrolled children for this fiscal year showed an increase of 5% when compared to FFY2018. From FFY 2018 to FFY 2019, Texas saw a 2.8% increase from the referral to the newly enrolled population. Thus, the percentage of the population with IFSPs continues to increase.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

7 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	97.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.50%	98.93%	98.44%	98.72%	98.79%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
7,556	8,379	98.79%	100%	99.09%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

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

747

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

State database

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

This data reflects all children with initial IFSPs who were evaluated and assessed during the three-month period of time from Sep 1, 2019 through Nov 30, 2019 (first quarter of SFY 2020)

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

All ECI local programs entered all required IFSP data for eligible infants and toddlers into the TKIDS database. Because the data from this period reflects stable enrollment trends, it is considered representative of the entire year's data and the full reporting period.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

We reviewed a total of 8,381 records of children entered in the TKIDS database. All were referred to ECI from Sep 1, 2019 through Nov 30, 2019, and of those, 7,556 received an evaluation/assessment and initial IFSP meeting within 45 days of referral to ECI, including delays in the meeting due to family circumstances.

Actual Data FFY 2019:

- A. Total records reviewed with a referral/evaluation/assessment and initial IFSP meeting in the first quarter of the state fiscal year: 8,379
- B. Infants or toddlers with an evaluation/assessment and initial IFSP within 45 days of referral: 7,556
- C. Infants or toddlers with an evaluation/assessment and initial IFSP after the 45 days of referral because of exceptional circumstances such as child or family illness, hospitalization of the child or another family member, or other family circumstances and other exceptional circumstances such as natural disasters or extreme weather-related conditions as documented in the child's record: 747
- D. Infants or toddlers with an evaluation/assessment and initial IFSP late due to other circumstances such as staff shortage, staff illness, scheduling difficulties, unclear documentation: 76

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
16	16	0	0

FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In compliance with OSEP Memo 09-02, ECI examines data from TKIDS at least one time per year to determine noncompliance with the requirements for the 45-day timeline (i.e., an initial evaluation, initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting conducted for eligible children). ECI provides a list of the potentially noncompliant cases to each ECI contractor and gives them the opportunity to review the data for accuracy and provide additional evidence that demonstrates compliance. Once the data is confirmed, ECI identifies cases that are, in fact, noncompliant. ECI issues findings based on the noncompliant cases. ECI identified 16 programs that were noncompliant. After this, performance specialists reviewed subsequent data through data monitoring for each ECI program to verify that the 16 ECI programs correctly implemented the specified regulatory requirements. Through this process, Texas Part C confirmed 100% correction of the cases in the 16 programs. The corrections were verified based on either onsite record review or verification of a sample of data in the TKIDS database for IFSPs that were developed within one year from identification of the finding.

Correction of System Findings

ECI ensures correction of a system finding by pulling a reasonable subsequent sample of data. System findings are cleared when the data indicates zero noncompliant cases, and must be cleared within one year of the issuance of the finding.

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

In compliance with OSEP Memo 09-02, ECI examines data from TKIDS at least one time per year to determine noncompliance with the requirements for the 45-day timeline (i.e., an initial evaluation, initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting conducted for eligible children), for each individual case.

Correction of Individual Child Findings

ECI ensures correction of individual child findings by verifying the correction within one year of the issuance of the finding. Corrective action is required unless the child is no longer in the jurisdiction of the ECI program.

Addressing Continued Noncompliance.

If an ECI contractor is unable to clear a child and/or system finding within one year of the issuance of the finding and demonstrates continued noncompliance with a lack of significant improvement, ECI may take remedial additional action, up to and including contract termination. This also negatively impacts the ECI contractor's annual determination.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2019-June 30, 2020). The State described how the time period in which the data were collected accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

7 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.18%	97.39%	95.24%	96.37%	98.54%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
4,340	4,431	98.54%	100%	98.42%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

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

21

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

State database

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

Data were collected in the first quarter of the state fiscal year (Sep 1, 2019 through Nov 30, 2019).

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

The data reflects all toddlers with IFSPs with transition steps and services between Sep 1, 2019 and Nov 30, 2019 (the first quarter of the state fiscal year 2020). Because the data from this period reflects stable enrollment trends, it is considered representative of the entire year's data and the full reporting period.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Total number of records reviewed for children exiting Part C: 4,431

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services: 4,340

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances such as child or family illness, hospitalization of the child or another family member, or other family circumstances and other exceptional circumstances such as natural disasters or extreme weather-related conditions as documented in the child's record: 21

Infants or toddlers with late transition steps due to other circumstances such as staff shortage, staff illness, scheduling difficulties, unclear documentation: 22

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
30	30	0	0

FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In compliance with OSEP Memo 09-02, ECI examines data from TKIDS at least one time per year to determine noncompliance with the requirements. ECI provides a list of the potentially noncompliant cases to each ECI contractor and gives them the opportunity to review the data for accuracy and provide additional evidence that demonstrates compliance. Once the data is confirmed, ECI identifies cases that are, in fact, noncompliant. ECI issues findings based on the noncompliant cases. ECI identified 30 programs that were noncompliant. After this, performance specialists reviewed subsequent data through data monitoring for each ECI program to verify that the 30 ECI programs correctly implemented the specified regulatory requirements. Through this process, Texas Part C confirmed 100% correction of the cases in the 30 programs. The corrections were verified based on either onsite record review or a sample of data in the TKIDS database for IFSPs that were developed within one year from identification of the finding and that all of them were corrected.

Correction of System Findings

ECI ensures correction of a system finding by pulling a reasonable subsequent sample of data. System findings are cleared when the data indicates zero noncompliant cases, and must be cleared within one year of the issuance of the finding.

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

In accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02, ECI examines data from TKIDS at least one time per year to determine noncompliance with the requirements, for each individual case.

Correction of Individual Child Findings

ECI ensures correction of individual child findings by verifying the correction within one year of the issuance of the finding. Corrective action is required unless the child is no longer in the jurisdiction of the ECI program.

Addressing Continued Noncompliance

If an ECI contractor is unable to clear a child and/or system finding within one year of the issuance of the finding and demonstrates continued

noncompliance with a lack of significant improvement, ECI may take remedial additional action, up to and including contract termination. This also negatively impacts the ECI contractor's annual determination.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

8A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8A - OSEP Response

The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2019-June 30, 2020). The State described how the time period in which the data were collected accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

8A - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8B - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	97.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	95.07%	92.94%	91.25%	94.32%	96.12%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

YES

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
3,591	4,332	96.12%	100%	96.20%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of parents who opted out

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

599

Describe the method used to collect these data

All ECI programs are required to notify the local educational agency (LEA) if a child enrolled in ECI services is potentially eligible for preschool services. The data reflects all toddlers with IFSPs who are potentially eligible for Part B special education services and whose notification was provided between September 1, 2019 and November 30, 2019 (the first quarter of the state fiscal year). Because the data from this period reflects stable enrollment trends, it is considered representative of the entire year's data and the full reporting period. The actual data excludes those families who exercised their right to opt out of the notification to Part B.

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

YES

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

YES

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

State database

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

The actual target data included all children who exited ECI and turned three years of age between September 1, 2019 and November 30, 2019 (the first quarter of state fiscal year).

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

The data reflects all toddlers who were potentially eligible for Part B and the notification to Part B was provided between September 1, 2019 and November 30, 2019 (the first quarter of the state fiscal year 2020). Because the data from this period reflects stable enrollment trends, it is considered representative of the entire year's data and the full reporting period.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services 3,591

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B 4,332

Number of parents who opted out 599

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances such as child or family illness, hospitalization of the child or another family member, or other family circumstances and other exceptional circumstances such as natural disasters or extreme weather-related conditions as documented in the child's record: 58

Infants or toddlers with late transition steps due to other circumstances such as staff shortage, staff illness, scheduling difficulties, unclear documentation: 142

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
39	39	0	0

FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In compliance with OSEP Memo 09-02, ECI examines data from TKIDS at least one time per year to determine noncompliance with the requirements. ECI provides a list of the potentially noncompliant cases to each ECI contractor and gives them the opportunity to review the data for accuracy and provide additional evidence that demonstrates compliance. Once the data is confirmed, ECI identifies cases that are, in fact, noncompliant. ECI issues findings based on the noncompliant cases. ECI identified 39 programs that were noncompliant. After this, performance specialists reviewed subsequent data through data monitoring for each ECI program to verify that the 39 ECI programs correctly implemented the specified regulatory requirements. Through this process, Texas Part C confirmed 100% correction of the cases in the 39 programs. The corrections were verified based on either onsite

record review or verification of a sample of data in the TKIDS database for IFSPs that were developed within one year from identification of the finding and that all of them were corrected.

Correction of System Findings

ECI ensures correction of a system finding by pulling a reasonable subsequent sample of data. System findings are cleared when the data indicates zero noncompliant cases, and must be cleared within one year of the issuance of the finding.

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

In accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02, ECI examines data from TKIDS at least one time per year to determine noncompliance with the requirements, for each individual case.

Correction of Individual Child Findings

ECI ensures correction of individual child findings by verifying the correction within one year of the issuance of the finding. Corrective action is required unless the child is no longer in the jurisdiction of the ECI program.

Addressing Continued Noncompliance

If an ECI contractor is unable to clear a child and/or system finding within one year of the issuance of the finding and demonstrates continued noncompliance with a lack of significant improvement, ECI may take remedial additional action, up to and including contract termination. This also negatively impacts the ECI contractor's annual determination.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

8B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8B - OSEP Response

The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2019-June 30, 2020). The State described how the time period in which the data were collected accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

8B - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8C - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	97.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	95.80%	90.69%	91.65%	92.30%	93.60%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
3,455	4,332	93.60%	100%	92.33%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

There was a 17% increase from FFY2018 in late transition conferences due to other circumstances such as staff shortage, staff illness, scheduling difficulties, unclear documentation. And, there was a 2% increase in the number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference. This may have led to a slight decrease of 1.27% when compared to FFY2018. The Texas Part C system continues to evaluate contractor performance on transition and will begin targeted follow-up with contractors who perform below the statewide average on this metric.

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

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

423

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

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

154

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

State database

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

The data reflects all toddlers who were potentially eligible for Part B and the notification to Part B was provided between Sep 1, 2019 and Nov 30, 2019 (the first quarter of the state fiscal year). Because the data from this period reflects stable enrollment trends, it is considered representative of the entire year's data and the full reporting period.

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

The actual target data included all children who exited ECI and turned three years of age between Sep 1, 2019 and Nov 30, 2019 (the first quarter of state fiscal year 2020).

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B: 4,332
 Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B: 3,455
 Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference: 423
 Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances such as child or family illness, hospitalization of the child or another family member, or other family circumstances and other exceptional circumstances such as natural disasters or extreme weather-related conditions as documented in the child's record: 154
 Infants or toddlers with late transition conference due to other circumstances such as staff shortage, staff illness, scheduling difficulties, unclear documentation: 257

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
30	30	0	0

FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In compliance with OSEP Memo 09-02, ECI examines data from TKIDS at least one time per year to determine noncompliance with the requirements. ECI provides a list of the potentially noncompliant cases to each ECI contractor and gives them the opportunity to review the data for accuracy and provide additional evidence that demonstrates compliance. Once the data is confirmed, ECI identifies cases that are, in fact, noncompliant. ECI issues findings based on the noncompliant cases. ECI identified 30 programs that were noncompliant. After this, performance managers reviewed subsequent

data through data monitoring for each ECI program to verify that the 30 ECI programs correctly implemented the specified regulatory requirements. Through this process, Texas Part C confirmed 100% correction of the cases in the 30 programs. Corrections were verified based on either onsite record review or verification of a sample of data in the TKIDS database for IFSPs that were developed within one year from identification of the finding.

Correction of System Findings:

ECI ensures correction of a system finding by pulling a reasonable subsequent sample of data. System findings are cleared when the data indicates zero noncompliant cases, and must be cleared within one year of the issuance of the finding.

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

In accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02, ECI examines data from TKIDS at least one time per year to determine noncompliance with the requirements, for each individual case.

Correction of Individual Child Findings:

ECI ensures correction of individual child findings by verifying the correction within one year of the issuance of the finding. Corrective action is required unless the child is no longer in the jurisdiction of the ECI program.

Addressing Continued Noncompliance:

If an ECI contractor is unable to clear a child and/or system finding within one year of the issuance of the finding and demonstrates continued noncompliance with a lack of significant improvement, ECI may take remedial additional action, up to and including contract termination. This also negatively impacts the ECI contractor's annual determination.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

8C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8C - OSEP Response

The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2019-June 30, 2020). The State described how the time period in which the data were collected accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

8C - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Select yes to use target ranges.

Target Range not used

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

NO

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ECI develops the Texas Part C APR with direction from the SICC, the ECI Advisory Committee. Stakeholders are involved in the review of data and improvement activities for all indicators. They also provide input into the targets. ECI state staff prepared a written draft of the APR that was disseminated to members of the ECI Advisory Committee. During their meeting held on January 13, 2021, the SICC members reviewed the draft and data, and provided comments that have been addressed throughout this report. For the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) specifically, stakeholders were identified in FFY 2014 and include members of the SICC, parents, agency representatives, advocacy groups, early childhood and prevention professionals, therapists and physicians. Texas ECI stakeholders identified improvement activities and developed an evaluation plan for improving social-emotional outcomes for children and families as a focus area. Stakeholders continue to participate in learning collaboratives, face-to-face meetings, webinars, conference calls, electronic communications, and inter-agency meetings to provide input, expertise and specific community needs and resources relevant to the SSIP.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2019
Target>=	

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

This Indicator is not applicable to the State.

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

10 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

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

NO

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1 a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ECI develops the Texas Part C APR with direction from the SICC, the ECI Advisory Committee. Stakeholders are involved in the review of data and improvement activities for all indicators. They also provide input into the targets. ECI state staff prepared a written draft of the APR that was disseminated to members of the ECI Advisory Committee. During their meeting held on January 13, 2021, the SICC members reviewed the draft and data, and provided comments that have been addressed throughout this report. For the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) specifically, stakeholders were identified in FFY 2014 and include members of the SICC, parents, agency representatives, advocacy groups, early childhood and prevention professionals, therapists and physicians. Texas ECI stakeholders identified improvement activities and developed an evaluation plan for improving social-emotional outcomes for children and families as a focus area. Stakeholders continue to participate in learning collaboratives, face-to-face meetings, webinars, conference calls, electronic communications, and inter-agency meetings to provide input, expertise and specific community needs and resources relevant to the SSIP.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target>=					
Data		100.00%		0.00%	

Targets

FFY	2019
Target>=	

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
		0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2019. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan



FFY19_SSIP_Template Texas Part C FINAL

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role

Lead Agency Director

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

Name:

Dana McGrath

Title:

Director

Email:

dana.mcgrath@hhs.texas.gov

Phone:

512-776-4324

Submitted on:

04/26/21 7:23:01 PM

ED Attachments



tx
-resultsmatrix-2021c.j



TX-2021DataRubricP
artC.xlsx



TX-C-Dispute-Resolut
ion-2019-20.pdf