

## Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

### Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The Lead Agency for Part C in Michigan is the State Education Agency, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE). Since program inception, the early intervention system has coordinated and collaborated with the Department of Human Services (DHS), the child well-being agency, and the Department of Community Health (DCH), which houses both mental health and public health, to implement the early intervention system for infants and toddlers with disabilities or developmental delays and their families.

The APR development process included input from partner agencies, data collected by various contractors, and a review by the Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC). Individual contractors are assigned responsibility for indicator-specific data. A series of meetings with partner agencies and contractors, both together and individually, were held to review and analyze data and develop appropriate activities. The data coordination meetings helped to align work and decrease redundancy of efforts.

Once the initial draft of the APR was completed, one staff member at MDE was assigned to coordinate the completion of the document. MDE staff and contractors reviewed each indicator using the provided APR Checklist. An enhanced draft of the APR was shared with the MICC in November 2008 for input and discussion. Suggestions were reviewed and, where appropriate, integrated into the document.

The need for a more flexible and comprehensive data system became more apparent with time. The Michigan Part C (known in Michigan as *Early On*<sup>®</sup>) data system was originally built to respond to the point-in-time 618 data collection requirements. Refinements to the general supervision system and the State Performance Plan (SPP) requirements increased the need for additional data. *Early On* migrated to a web-based data system in December 2008, which includes additional data fields to collect SPP information.

In Michigan, Parts B and C have been involved in the development of a more comprehensive monitoring system (Continuous Improvement Monitoring System, CIMS-2). The monitoring system has gone through various iterations to respond to the changes mandated as a result of the 2004 Reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act. There are three components to CIMS-2: (1) Focused Monitoring; (2) Data Analysis, which includes a process for notifying local early intervention programs of findings which require corrective action plans for compliance indicators and improvement plans for results indicators; and (3) Verification. Additional assistance to local programs is provided by local regional monitoring staff on how to correct for individual noncompliance and how to develop practices to assure ongoing compliance. Verification that each local early intervention services program is correctly implementing a specific regulatory requirement starts with MDE requesting that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever is greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the Federal and State standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. The focused monitoring component of CIMS-2 has been implemented and the data analysis portion of CIMS-2 began April 2009. A pilot program for the validation process took place in September 2009, allowing seven pilot sites to verify specific data points in the CIMS-2 system. All local early intervention programs now participate in the validation process through the CIMS-2 system.

The revised Michigan Part C of IDEA SPP can be downloaded at [www.michigan.gov/earlyon](http://www.michigan.gov/earlyon).

**Public Reporting**

FFY 2009 public reporting on the performance of each local early intervention service program on the required indicators was posted on MDE’s website: [www.michigan.gov/earlyon](http://www.michigan.gov/earlyon). Data were shared with the stakeholder group, the MICC, and activities discussed with various advisory subgroups. Prior to release, local programs were asked to review their data. After the various reviews, a media advisory was released by MDE’s Office of Communications directing stakeholders to the site.

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

**Indicator 1:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.  
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

**Measurement:**  
Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.  
Account for untimely receipt of services, including the reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:**

99.84%

Data were collected in the Michigan Electronic Grants System (MEGS) through a local self-assessment. Local early intervention programs were required to select a random representative sample of children. Local early intervention programs were required to sample 10% of their snapshot number or a minimum of ten records, whichever was greater. The records were a representative sample chosen from July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2011.

**Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive Early Intervention Services in a Timely Manner:**

a. Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	<b>628</b>
b. Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	<b>629</b>
Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner (Percent = [(a) divided by (b)] times 100)	<b>99.84%</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:**

Michigan has defined timely services as the provision of services within 30 calendar days from when a parent/guardian consents to the provision of early intervention services. During FFY 2010, **99.84%** of

## Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

infants and toddlers with IFSPs had all early intervention services on their IFSPs initiated within 30 calendar days of parent consent to the services.

The increase in performance rate in FFY 2010 as compared to FFY 2009 (97.83%) may be attributed to a number of factors. Michigan's early intervention system had several new staff members enter into the system in FFY 2009 and training was an on-going priority for staff. The emphasis on training ensured that early intervention programs had a better understanding of the requirements of Indicator 1. In addition, the early intervention programs have a better understanding of exceptional family circumstances.

During FFY 2010, Michigan continued updating the Michigan Part C data system to include the collection of data regarding providing services in a timely manner; details of Michigan's progress with the upgrades are provided in the discussion of the planned improvement activities in this indicator. In order to collect data for this indicator, the whole State submitted data in a local self-assessment using the MEGS.

Michigan did not meet the target of 100% compliance on this indicator. Through self assessment, details on exceptional family circumstances were recorded and included in the FFY 2010 calculation. Ten exceptional family circumstances were included in the calculation. They included requests from parents to wait on services, hospitalization of children, and parents not home. The one child who did not have timely services initiated and did not have an exceptional family circumstance received the services indicated on his/her IFSP. As part of the local self-assessment in MEGS, early intervention programs were asked to document any causes for the delay. A sick staff person was the reason for the delay in the timely start of the child's services. In addition, as part of the local self-assessment, early intervention programs had to indicate whether the child received services and in all cases the child did receive the services indicated on his/her IFSP.

Five local early intervention programs were issued findings in FFY 2009 and each had to submit, for approval, a corrective action plan in the CIMS-2 system that detailed strategies that the local early intervention program would take to correct noncompliance, as soon as possible, but no later than one year from notification of the finding, including verification by the State. As part of the corrective action planning process, progress reports were submitted. Local early intervention programs were provided assistance by local regional monitors to develop corrective action plans and correct individual and systemic noncompliance. Progress reports required the local early intervention program to conduct file reviews. When progress reports indicated compliance or that a State target had been met, MDE required early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency for verification of correction of noncompliance. A sample of new records was sent to MDE and MDE used a checklist to verify correction of noncompliance.

Verification involves review of a new sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1). MDE requested that the local early intervention program identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever was greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon Federal and State standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family.

Local early intervention programs are notified of the outcome of verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter. The collection of exceptional family circumstances helps compliance with this indicator. Another reason for progress in this indicator is the training and technical assistance provided by the State and the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) training entity.

## Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan  
State

In order to maintain compliance, MDE will continue providing technical assistance through online trainings through MDE's Comprehensive System of Professional Development (CSPD) contractor. In addition, MDE will monitor periodic data to assure that local early intervention programs that are found to be in noncompliance write and implement corrective action plans.

### Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2009 for this indicator: 97.83%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2009 (the period from July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010)	5
2. Number of FFY 2009 findings the State verified as timely corrected (verified as corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	5
3. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

### Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

4. Number of FFY 2009 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2009 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	0
6. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

### Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

All FFY 2009 findings were verified and closed as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from the date the finding was issued, including verification by the State.

### Verification of Correction of FFY 2008 noncompliance or FFY 2008 findings (either timely or subsequent):

All findings from subsequent years have been verified and closed.

# Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

## Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(e), 303.344(f)(1), and 303.340(c). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>	<p>Michigan has verified correction of noncompliance for all local early intervention programs that were issued findings in FFY 2009. No findings were issued in FFY 2008, all noncompliance was continued noncompliance. The State reported the correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2008 APR. In FFY 2010, one service area was issued a finding of noncompliance for Indicator 1. The service area has received a focused monitoring visit and has completed a corrective action plan. The finding issued in FFY 2010 will be closed as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from notification, including verification by the State.</p> <p>The State has reviewed the improvement activities for this indicator.</p>
<p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1) (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 initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>	<p>MDE requested that the five service areas identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever was greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the Federal and State standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. Verification involves review of a sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1).</p> <p>Local early intervention programs are notified of the outcome of verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter. The collection of exceptional family circumstances helps compliance with this indicator. Another reason for the progress in this indicator is the training and technical assistance provided by the State and the training entity.</p>

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred in FFY 2010:

An update on the progress of each activity is included. Activities that were completed in FFY 2009 or earlier and have been explained in the FFY 2009 APR, have been removed.

# Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
<b>Activity:</b> Analyze data measuring this indicator and develop additional improvement activities.	Ongoing with annual review through 2012	Interagency staff Part C contractors MICC Stakeholders
<b>Activity:</b> Increase communication with Intermediate School District (ISD) Special Education Directors through a planned stakeholder group and attendance at their quarterly meetings.	Ongoing	MDE staff [Office of Great Start/Early Childhood Education & Family Services (ECE&FS) and Office of Special Education (OSE) (formerly Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services)] CIMS contractor
<b>Discussion:</b> Most local <i>Early On</i> Coordinators are supervised by the Intermediate School District (ISD) Special Education Director. Additionally, Michigan Special Education, birth to three years, is the largest provider of services to children enrolled in Part C. Therefore it is vitally important that ISD Special Education Directors understand the Part C requirements and are involved in decision-making as stakeholders. Increased communication with ISD Special Education Directors will both improve their understanding of Part C regulations and policies and increase MDE staff members' understanding of the interrelationship between Part C and Michigan Special Education.		
<b>Activity:</b> Develop guidance on determining which services are <i>Early On</i> services versus which are 'other' services.	Winter 2008  Ongoing	MDE staff Interagency staff North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC)
<b>Discussion:</b> In Michigan, services available to children birth to three years, whether enrolled in Part C or not, through State or local partners are not considered Part C services when the partners refuse to meet Part C regulations. Because best practice dictates that these services be coordinated through Part C, they are included on the IFSP as 'other' services. Record reviews, focused monitoring visits, and personal discussions have revealed that there are varying interpretations across the state about what is an <i>Early On</i> service versus what is an 'other' service. Clarifying this confusion will help ensure the correct completion of IFSPs and the collection of data on <i>Early On</i> services.		
<b>Activity:</b> Add component in the CIMS system to validate data entered into Michigan's Part C data system.	2010-2012	MDE staff CIMS contractor
<b>Discussion:</b> Beginning in FFY 2009, CIMS added a component to allow local early intervention programs to validate data. In FFY 2009, pilot sites were chosen to complete this activity. In FFY 2010, all local early intervention programs were required to complete validation activities through CIMS. The CIMS system requires every local early intervention system to validate data each year. The ISD Monitor is responsible for conducting this activity.		
<b>Activity:</b> Update Michigan's Part C data system to allow local early intervention systems to enter exceptional family circumstances.	2010-2012 <b>Complete</b>	MDE staff Michigan Part C data system
<b>Discussion:</b> Beginning in FFY 2009, Michigan's data system added a field to designate the reason for late services. Local early intervention programs were required to enter this field as of July 1, 2010. Local early intervention programs were required to document each time a child did not receive his/her services in a timely manner.		
<b>Activity:</b> Update Michigan's Part C data system to allow local early intervention programs to generate reports to indicate when timelines need to be met.	2010-2012 <b>Complete</b>	MDE staff Michigan Part C data system
<b>Discussion:</b> The Michigan Part C data system allows local early intervention programs to generate reports for a variety of activities. Local early intervention programs can create lists for timelines. This will help local early intervention programs with compliance indicators.		

# Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

<b>Activity:</b> Train local early intervention programs to use all components of Michigan's Part C data system.	2010-ongoing	MDE staff Michigan Part C data system
<b>Discussion:</b> Training local early intervention programs on the new components of the Part C data system as well as CIMS will allow the programs to utilize the enhancements to ensure compliance.		

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011 (if applicable):**

MDE is supporting the move of child/student data into the Michigan Student Data System. This will begin the long-term goal of longitudinal study of children/students throughout their educational tenure.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

See page 1 of this APR.

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

**Indicator 2:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

**Measurement:**

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	93%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2010: 96.95%**

In FFY 2010, **96.95%** of infants and toddlers with IFSPs primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings = 10,067  
 Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs = 10,384  
 10,067 divided by 10,384 = 0.9695 X 100 = 96.95%  
 Data source: Michigan Part C data system, December 2010 collection

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2010:**

	12/1/02	12/1/03	12/1/04	12/1/05	12/1/06	12/1/07	12/1/08	12/1/09	12/1/10
% of infants and toddlers who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.	76.82	77.46	84.41	84.2	88.1	92.41	93.31	94.31	96.95

Data source: Michigan Part C data system, December 2010 collection

**Michigan Part C FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table:**

N/A

**FFY 2006 Findings:**

Of the four local early intervention programs that had findings related to the percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings, all corrected within one year.

**FFY 2007 Findings:**

No findings for FFY 2007 for this indicator were made.

**FFY 2008 Findings:**

No findings for FFY 2008 for this indicator were made.

**FFY 2009 Findings:**

No findings for FFY 2009 for this indicator were made.

**Progress/Slippage:**

In FFY 2010, Michigan exceeded its target of 93% with 96.95% for this indicator. Michigan used the 618 reporting data that were due February 1, 2010. Progress on this indicator can be attributed to the training modules that are available through MDE's CSPD contractor. The training modules helped local early intervention programs understand the definition of natural environment. In addition, training on providing individualized justifications when services were not provided in the natural environment assisted local early intervention programs understand the requirements of this SPP/APR indicator. The training modules, as well as training on data entry, assisted local early intervention programs to enter correct data for reporting. To help local early intervention programs to continue meeting and/or exceeding the State target, MDE and its CSPD contractor will continue training on this indicator.

**Improvement Activities:**

Michigan made progress and exceeded its target of 93%. The following activities will occur to ensure at least 93% of infants and toddlers in Michigan receive services in the home or community-based settings. An update on the progress of each activity is included.

Improvement Activity	Timelines	Resources
<b>Activity:</b> Focused Monitoring Follow Up.	Ongoing	MDE
<b>Discussion:</b> Four service areas received focused monitoring and a report from MDE stating areas of concern. At the follow up visit, each service area had met or exceeded its target. All service areas that had findings in this area have corrected them.		
<b>Activity:</b> The Michigan Part C data system will be upgraded to ensure timely and accurate collection of utilization and outcome data for <i>Early On</i> .	2006-2012 Ongoing  <b>Completed</b>	Part C Administrative Structure Michigan Part C data system contractor
<b>Discussion:</b> The Michigan Part C data system upgrades moved forward during the reporting period and continue at the time of this report; as of the December 1, 2008, 618 count, all 57 service areas are utilizing the upgraded system. Updates to the Michigan Part C data system have been made to include actual start date of each new service listed on the initial and subsequent IFSPs. Coding has been added for natural environments data to allow service areas to identify whether services were provided in the home, community setting, or other. In addition, the system also collects data related to exceptional family circumstances. This will allow Michigan to notify service areas of findings in a more timely manner, report data from all 57 service areas for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, better analyze reasons for noncompliance, and provide additional data about the local service areas.		
The process of upgrading the Michigan Part C data system has been time and resource consuming at the State and local levels. Adding fields to a web-based data collection system is approximately a three year process. One year is		

# APR Template – Part C (4)

<p>required to program and pilot the changes. Another year is needed to train staff and provide technical assistance to get valid and reliable data. Data will be available for reporting in FFY 2009 APR.</p> <p>For the FFY 2009 APR, to be submitted in February 2011, data for this indicator were collected through the Michigan Part C data system.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Training and technical assistance on the provision of natural environments will be continued by the CSPD contractor to incorporate elements from the <i>Implementation Guide to Natural Environments</i> into their trainings. The training's effectiveness will be measured through pre- and post-tests for training participants through the CSPD system. Amendments to the training will be made based on results achieved.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>CSPD contractor Michigan Part C data system contractor Interagency staff</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The CSPD contractor continued to provide training and technical assistance on the provision of services in the natural environment, especially to low-performing service areas. The contractor shared the <i>Implementation Guide</i> with local early intervention programs, and it is posted on their website.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> The data dictionary continues to be revised and training will occur.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Michigan Part C data system contractor Interagency staff</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The data dictionary is updated on a regular basis. The Michigan Part C data system has been aligned with OSEP 618 requirements and is being upgraded to meet SPP data needs.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Training will occur around the common definition of services provided in the natural environment, documentation, and how to report it through data collection.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>CSPD contractor</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The CSPD contractor continued to provide training and technical assistance on the provision of services in the natural environment, especially to low-performing service areas. Additionally, the contractor developed a training and technical assistance module specifically targeted to this indicator and its related requirements.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Develop Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for training and technical assistance, and child find and public awareness contracts.</p>	<p><b>Completed</b> May 2007</p>	<p>Interagency staff</p>
<p><b>Activity:</b> Award training and technical assistance, and child find and public awareness contracts.</p>	<p><b>Completed</b> October 2007</p>	<p>MDE</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The RFPs for training and technical assistance, and child find and public awareness were developed and awarded during the reporting period. The revised systems began October 1, 2007. The previous CSPD contractor was again awarded both the training and technical assistance and the child find and public awareness contracts with changes made based on <i>Early On Redesign</i>, funding decreases, the SPP, and system needs.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Analyze data measuring this indicator and develop additional improvement activities.</p>	<p>Ongoing with annual review through 2012</p>	<p>Interagency staff Part C contractors MICC Stakeholders</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> As evidenced in the APR, analysis of data from multiple sources related to the SPP indicators has led to the development of additional, more targeted, improvement activities.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Require each of the 57 local service areas to utilize the Michigan State Prototype IFSP, IFSP/IEP, Transition, Consent to Evaluate, and Authorization to Share forms or submit the locally-developed form(s) for State approval.</p>	<p>Summer 2008  <b>Completed</b></p>	<p>CSPD contractor MDE staff</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The 57 local early intervention programs were required to either use the Michigan State prototype forms or submit their locally-developed forms. Requiring local early intervention programs to use the prototype forms or their approved forms ensures that all required components are present, including a justification when services are not provided in the natural environment.</p>		

# APR Template – Part C (4)

<b>Activity:</b> Increase communication with ISD Special Education Directors through monthly conference calls, a planned stakeholder group, and attendance at their quarterly meetings.	Ongoing	MDE staff (ECE&FS and OSE) ISD Special Education Directors <i>Early On</i> local coordinators
<b>Discussion:</b> Staff participate in the monthly Special Education Directors' calls. This ensures that any questions or updates are being received at the Special Education Director level.		
<b>Activity:</b> Require local early intervention programs not meeting compliance or performance targets to contact and accept guidance from Michigan's training and technical assistance providers.	Ongoing	CSPD contractor
<b>Discussion:</b> As part of findings and determinations, those service areas that are not substantially in compliance, and thus receiving a finding and a Needs Assistance determination or Needs Intervention determination, must work with Michigan's technical assistance providers. Michigan's technical assistance providers assist the local early intervention programs to create improvement plans and therefore increase compliance.		
<b>Activity:</b> The CSPD contractor will review the new training and technical assistance module on natural environments to ensure that all related requirements are included in the training.	<b>Completed</b>	CSPD contractor Grant manager
<b>Discussion:</b> Michigan's personnel development system has reviewed and made changes to the natural environments module to include more in-depth training on when and why services are not held in the natural environment.		
<b>Activity:</b> Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS-2)	Ongoing	CIMS contractor MDE
<b>Discussion:</b> CIMS-2 is being updated to better align with the APR. CIMS-2 will become a data analysis tool which will allow early intervention programs to analyze causes for not meeting State targets.		
<b>Activity:</b> The PTI grantee, Michigan Alliance for Families, will create and disseminate mini-folders to parents whose children are enrolled in Part C.	<b>Completed</b>	Michigan PTI grantee Parent Involvement Committee (PIC) MDE staff
<b>Discussion:</b> Mini-folders are being developed around topics such as IFSP, natural environments, family rights, and transition. These mini-folders will be shared with parents in small groups in informal gatherings, allowing time to answer questions and explain the materials. This activity replicates the support provided to Part B families. Drafts of the mini-folders were shared in June 2010 with the PIC and feedback was given. Revisions will be made and shared with the PIC when completed. The mini-folders will allow the parent mentors to have a set of documents that guide a structured introductory conversation about Child and Family Outcomes, IFSPs, natural environments, family rights and/or transition to use with families in <i>Early On</i> .		

## Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011:

N/A

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See page 1 of this APR.

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

**Indicator 3:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

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

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

**Measurement:**

- 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 and exited early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:**

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

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

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2:** Percent = # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus [# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e) divided by the total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.

**Target Data and Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:**

Targets and Actual Data for Part C Children Exiting in FFY 2010 (2010-2011)

Summary Statements	Targets FFY 2010 (% of children)	Actual FFY 2010 (% of children)
<b>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)</b>		
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program	74.8%	75.1%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program	59.7%	60.9%
<b>Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)</b>		
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program	79.3%	78.6%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they exited the program	54.2%	55.3%
<b>Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs</b>		
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program	78.6%	79.0%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they exited the program	59.7%	58.0%

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2010:**

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

The State continued the progress in developing its outcome measurement system over the past year:

**1. Training/Supporting Service Areas**

- A Training and Technical Assistance program continues to address the child outcomes data collection process. The Qualitative Compliance Information Project (QCIP) provided a component of the training to address the use of the COSF and web-based data entry procedures. The training closely reflected the content of the Child Outcomes Handbook. Michigan’s CSPD contractor also provided a training component discussing best practices for including parents (and other individuals chosen by the parents) in the process. Both components were provided in collaboration with State interagency staff to create shared responsibility, knowledge, and coordination across all levels of the system.

**2. Sampling Plan – Phase In**

- Data collection did proceed according to the sampling plan previously submitted to OSEP. Cohort 1, which includes a representative sample of one-third of the 57 local service areas, began collecting entry data on all children enrolled in *Early On* as of July 1, 2006, and exit data for any child exiting *Early On* who had been receiving services continuously for six months. Cohort 2 began collecting entry data on all children enrolled as of July 1, 2007, and exit data for any child who had been receiving services continuously for six months. Cohort 3 began collecting entry data on all children enrolled as of July 1, 2008, and exit data for any child who had been receiving services continuously for six months. This is the third year that Michigan has all service areas providing child outcome data.

**3. Data Collection and Management and Data Quality Assurance**

- All data from the child outcomes rating tool are entered into a web-based data entry system, with a copy of the rating tool retained in the child's central record. The data system includes the following variables:
  - Date summary form completed
  - Timeframe for which the data were collected (Entry, Exit, Exceptional Circumstance)
  - 1-7 point rating for each of the three child outcomes
  - Assessment of progress (for Exit)

In addition, upgrades to the data entry system included error-check features, ensuring quality data. The system catches errors or impossible data before data entry is completed, preventing inaccurate data from being entered. Error messages inform data entry personnel when incorrect data are being entered, including impossible assessment dates, incorrect COSF rating dates, or invalid rating on whether the child has shown new skills since the entry COSF rating.

- Data Auditing. The online COSF data are regularly audited, including names, dates, and impossible progress ratings. COSF rating dates are compared to IFSP signature dates to ensure that all children were entered during the required time period and exited after participating in Part C for a minimum of six months. In order to eliminate and reduce error, the web-based COSF requires entry for all fields except for the children's middle initials. Data entry personnel are prevented from proceeding to the next section of the website until all data are entered.
- Period Count Verifications. The QCIP coordinated with service area staff to acquire a list of children for whom they are responsible for entering data for the data collection period. If discrepancies were found, the QCIP worked closely with each of the service areas to go over the list of children. QCIP staff also helped local service areas to identify extreme circumstances and documented these cases in the online system.
- Human Subjects Protection. The QCIP developed procedures for the web-based data entry system to ensure human subjects protection and data security, including: (a) a list of approved users are allowed access to the online COSF system; (b) the online COSF system limits the operation time to 15 minutes per section - if there is no server activity for 15 minutes, it will timeout so as to protect child information from unapproved passers-by; (c) all data transmitted and received by the QCIP research team are encrypted using Secure Sockets Layer (SSL) technology; and (d) the web-based COSF data are saved as a secure Microsoft SQL database on the QCIP research team's server, accessible only to key personnel who have received Wayne State University's Human Investigation Committee's Human Subjects approval.

**Data for FFY 2006 (July 1, 2006 - June 30, 2007) – Former Baseline Data**

- A new data collection method was implemented, using the COSF adapted from the ECO Center's COSF. In the FFY 2004 SPP, Michigan submitted a sampling plan to be used for the pilot study for early childhood outcomes. This plan divided the 57 service areas into three representative cohorts. OSEP approved this plan.

## APR Template – Part C (4)

- For FFY 2006, Cohort 1, one-third of the 57 service areas, began collecting entry data on all children enrolling in Part C as of July 1, 2006, and progress data on any of those children exiting by June 30, 2007, who had received services continuously for at least six months.

### Data for FFY 2007 (July 1, 2007 - June 30, 2008)

- For FFY 2007, Cohort 1 continued with data collection and Cohort 2 began collecting entry data on all children enrolling in Part C as of July 1, 2007, and progress data on any of those children exiting by June 30, 2008, who had received services continuously for at least six months.

### Data for FFY 2008 (July 1, 2008 - June 30, 2009) - New Baseline Data, Per New Reporting Requirements

- For FFY 2008, Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 are continuing data collection and Cohort 3 began collecting entry data on all children enrolling in Part C as of July 1, 2008, and progress data on any of those children exiting by June 30, 2009, who had received services continuously for at least six months.

### Data for FFY 2009 (July 1, 2009 - June 30, 2010)

- For FFY 2009, the three cohorts collected entry data on all children enrolling in Part C as of July 1, 2009, and progress data on any of those children exiting by June 30, 2010, who had received services continuously for at least six months.

### Data for FFY 2010 (July 1, 2010 - June 30, 2011)

- For FFY 2010, the three cohorts collected entry data on all children enrolling in Part C as of July 1, 2010, and progress data on any of those children exiting by June 30, 2011, who had received services continuously for at least six months.

### Entry Results

During FFY 2010, entry data were collected for 7,228 children.

Children enrolling in Part C/Early On during FFY 2010 most frequently showed delays in the areas of Acquisition/Use of Knowledge and Skills (81.1%) and Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs (79.2%), with somewhat fewer children showing delays in Positive Social-Emotional Skills (66.5%). See Table 1 below.

Table 1: Part C/Early On Child Outcomes - FFY 2010 Entry Results

	SPP3A Social-Emotional		SPP3B Acquisition/Use of Knowledge		SPP3C Use of Appropriate Behaviors	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Comparable to same-aged peers (Entry rating of 6 or 7)	2,421	33.5%	1,365	18.9%	1,501	20.8%
Below same-aged peers (Entry rating of 1-5)	4,807	66.5%	5,863	81.1%	5,727	79.2%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7,228</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>7,228</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>7,228</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Progress Results – Five Progress Categories

For FFY 2010, there were 3,952 COSFs across the 57 service areas for children with entry data and who exited by June 30, 2011, after receiving services for a minimum of six continuous months. Table 2 below displays the results for each of the three indicators along the five progress categories.

Table 2. Part C/Early On Child Outcomes - FFY 2010 Progress Results (Five Progress Categories)

<b>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):</b>	<b>Number of children</b>	<b>% of children</b>
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	19	.5%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	693	17.5%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	834	21.1%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,315	33.3%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,091	27.6%
Total	N=3,952	100%
<b>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication):</b>	<b>Number of children</b>	<b>% of children</b>
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	11	.2%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	702	17.8%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	1,054	26.7%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,565	39.6%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	620	15.7%
Total	N=3,952	100%
<b>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:</b>	<b>Number of children</b>	<b>% of children</b>
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	12	.2%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	666	16.9%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	980	24.8%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,571	39.8%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	723	18.3%
Total	N=3,952	100%

**Progress Results – Summary Statements**

Table 3 below presents the progress results, using the required summary statements.

*Table 3: Part C/Early On Child Outcomes - FFY 2010 Progress Results (Summary Statements)*

	<b>Summary Statement 1</b>	<b>Summary Statement 2</b>
Description	Of those infants and toddlers who entered Part C below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who <b>substantially increased</b> their rate of growth by the time they exited.	The percent of infants and toddlers who were <b>functioning within age expectations</b> in each Outcome by the time they exited.
Measurement	[(c+d) divided by (a+b+c+d)] times 100	[(d+e) divided by (a+b+c+d+e)] times 100
SPP 3A: Social Emotional	<b>75.1%</b> [(834+1,315)÷(19+693+834+1,315)] X 100%	<b>60.9%</b> [(1,315+1,091)÷3,952] X 100%
SPP 3B: Knowledge Acquisition	<b>78.6%</b> [(1,054+1,565)÷(11+702+1,054+1,565)] X 100%	<b>55.3%</b> [(1,565+620)÷3,952] X 100%
SPP 3C: Appropriate Behaviors	<b>79.0%</b> [(980+1,571)÷(12+666+980+1,571)] X 100%	<b>58.0%</b> [(1,571+723)÷3,952] X 100%

**Discussion of Progress Results, Based on Summary Statements - FFY 2010:**

**Summary Statement 1:** Overall, the data indicates that of those infants and toddlers enrolled in Part C/Early On **below age expectations** in each Outcome, **more than three-quarters substantially increased** their rate of growth by the time they exited.

- Positive Social-Emotional Skills: 75.1% (meets FFY 2010 target of 74.8%)
- Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills: 78.6% (does not meet FFY 2010 target of 79.3%)
- Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs: 79.0% (meets FFY 2010 target of 78.6%)

**Summary Statement 2:** Overall, the data indicates that **more than half** of infants and toddlers were **functioning within age expectations** in each Outcome by the time they exited.

- Positive Social-Emotional Skills: 60.9% (meets FFY 2010 target of 59.7%)
- Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills: 55.3% (meets FFY 2010 target of 54.2%)
- Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs: 58.0% (does not meet FFY 2010 target of 59.7%)

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Measurable and Rigorous Target</b>
<b>2005</b> (2005-2006)	No target setting.
<b>2006</b> (2006-2007)	No target setting.

**APR Template – Part C (4)**

<p><b>2007</b> (2007-2008)</p>	<p>No target setting.</p>
<p><b>2008</b> (2008-2009)</p>	<p><u>Baseline data: Summary Statement 1:</u>                  SPP 3A: <del>74.0%</del> 76.2%                  SPP 3B: <del>79.1%</del> 79.4%                  SPP 3C: <del>78.1%</del> 79.4%</p> <p><u>Baseline data: Summary Statement 2:</u>                  SPP 3A: <del>59.2%</del> 60.7%                  SPP 3B: <del>54.0%</del> 51.1%                  SPP 3C: <del>59.4%</del> 60.0%</p>
<p><b>2009</b> (2009-2010)</p>	<p><u>Target Set: Summary Statement 1:</u>                  SPP 3A: 74.5%                  SPP 3B: 79.0%                  SPP 3C: 78.3%</p> <p><u>Target Set: Summary Statement 2:</u>                  SPP 3A: 59.4%                  SPP 3B: 53.8%                  SPP 3C: 59.5%</p>
<p><b>2010</b> (2010-2011)</p>	<p><u>Target Set: Summary Statement 1:</u>                  SPP 3A: 74.8%                  SPP 3B: 79.3%                  SPP 3C: 78.6%</p> <p><u>Target Set: Summary Statement 2:</u>                  SPP 3A: 59.7%                  SPP 3B: 54.2%                  SPP 3C: 59.7%</p>
<p><b>2011</b> (2011-2012)</p>	<p><u>Target Set: Summary Statement 1:</u>                  SPP 3A: 74.8%                  SPP 3B: 79.3%                  SPP 3C: 78.6%</p> <p><u>Target Set: Summary Statement 2:</u>                  SPP 3A: 59.7%                  SPP 3B: 54.2%                  SPP 3C: 59.7%</p>
<p><b>2012</b> (2012-2013)</p>	<p><u>Target Set: Summary Statement 1:</u>                  SPP 3A: 76.3%                  SPP 3B: 79.5%                  SPP 3C: 79.5%</p> <p><u>Target Set: Summary Statement 2:</u>                  SPP 3A: 60.8%                  SPP 3B: 51.2%                  SPP 3C: 60.1%</p>

# APR Template – Part C (4)

The following activities were included in the SPP that was updated in February 2010. An update on the progress of each activity is included.

Improvement Activity	Timelines	Resources
<b>Activity:</b> A child outcomes rating tool will be implemented to capture both entry and progress data on all children who enter and exit in FFY 2006 after at least six months of service.	<b>Completed</b>  Ongoing	Interagency staff Part C contractors Stakeholders
<b>Discussion:</b> The tool has been created and implemented. Initial data analysis, coupled with feedback from local service areas, identified several features that could be improved. Improvements are underway and their impact will be monitored during the upcoming years.		
<b>Activity:</b> A handbook has been distributed and used to clarify procedures and policy around gathering child outcomes ratings, including appropriate assessment tools, timeframes for collecting data, etc.	<b>Completed</b>  Ongoing	Interagency staff Part C contractors Stakeholders
<b>Discussion:</b> The handbook is in use and has been modified several times to respond to questions and feedback from local users, information gained from NECTAC and the ECO Center, and resources from the Outcomes conference website. Improvements to the handbook will continue as implementation of our child outcomes data collection continues.		
<b>Activity:</b> Local service area personnel will be trained to use the new child outcomes rating tool, and in best practices to ensure that parents are included in establishing child outcomes ratings.	Ongoing	Interagency staff Part C contractors
<b>Discussion:</b> All 57 service areas have received training. The training protocol is being reviewed over the winter of 2008-2009 to integrate new materials from national resources and in response to questions and feedback from local users.		
<b>Activity:</b> Per the sampling plan submitted to OSEP, data collection on all children enrolling in <i>Early On</i> was phased in between July 1, 2006, and July 1, 2008. Cohort 1 began collecting and reporting child outcomes data during FFY 2006.	January-June 2007 and ongoing	Local service areas Part C contractors
<b>Discussion:</b> Implementation of the data collection plan is proceeding as anticipated, Cohort 3 started data collection July 1, 2008. Since July 2008, all 57 local early intervention programs have been collecting and reporting child outcomes data.		
<b>Activity:</b> FFY 2006 data will be submitted to the Part C contractor for processing and analysis.	<b>Completed</b>  Ongoing	Local service areas Part C contractors
<b>Discussion:</b> Data analysis for 2006 is complete. Data submission will continue, with preliminary analysis and data cleaning on an ongoing basis, and full analysis of the 2008 sample beginning August 2009.		
<b>Activity:</b> The Michigan Part C data system will be upgraded to ensure timely and accurate collection of utilization and outcome data for <i>Early On</i> .	2006-2012 Ongoing  <b>Completed</b>	Part C Administrative structure Michigan Part C data system contractor
<b>Discussion:</b> In addition to general Michigan Part C data system upgrades described under Indicator 1, updates to the data system will eventually include the collection of child outcomes data. This will eliminate duplicate data entry, provide a method for ensuring that child outcomes data are entered for every child in a timely manner, and enable Part C and 619 to align and utilize each other's child outcome data.		
<b>Activity:</b> Crosswalk Part C child outcomes with <i>Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infants and Toddlers (ECSQ-I/T)</i> , <i>Early Development and Learning Strands</i> , which were adopted by the Michigan State Board of Education on December 12, 2006.	Winter 2008  <b>Completed</b>	Interagency staff
<b>Discussion:</b> This activity will help Michigan demonstrate the connections between Part C outcomes and the State-adopted early learning standards. While originally scheduled for winter 2007, this had been postponed in order to work on other priorities related to compliance. The crosswalk has been completed and is in the process of department review. User guidance has been developed to accompany this alignment.		

# APR Template – Part C (4)

<p><b>Activity:</b> Monitor data measuring this indicator and develop additional improvement activities to enhance the system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individually, to improve individual IFSPs based on results.</li> <li>• Locally, to improve local service area policy and procedures.</li> <li>• Statewide, to improve policy and program decision making, including personnel development.</li> </ul>	2006-2010	Interagency staff Part C contractors MICC Stakeholders
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The child outcomes report will be shared with local service areas so that they can use it to support evaluation of their local systems. Likewise, the data will be presented to the MICC for discussion related to State-level improvements to <i>Early On</i>.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Continue to utilize ECO Center and NECTAC resources as activities are implemented and results are reviewed.</p>	2006-2010	Interagency staff Part C contractors
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Resources from the ECO Center and NECTAC have been very valuable as the child outcomes process has been implemented in Michigan. Such resources are continually reviewed and utilized to address questions and issues and to improve Michigan's process.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Continue to link with 619 child outcomes efforts to ensure efficiency, consistency, and continuity in child outcomes data collection efforts.</p>	2006-2010	Interagency staff Part C contractors
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Several conversations took place between Part C and 619 staff regarding child outcomes data collection in which information was shared about the successes of each process; procedures were developed for sharing child outcomes ratings at age three as children exit from <i>Early On</i> and enroll in 619. Additionally, meetings are planned for coordinating the switch to collecting child outcomes data through the Michigan Part C data system and the Michigan 619 data system.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Distribute child outcomes report to local service areas for review and discussion.</p>	Ongoing	Interagency staff Part C contractors
<p><b>Discussion:</b> A plan will be developed for sharing and discussing results of the first full year of child outcomes data collection in order to support greater understanding of the purpose and process, and support local system evaluation and development of local improvement activities. Our child outcomes data contractor held four meetings throughout the state in 2009, with local early intervention programs, to discuss child outcomes data.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Improve system ability to predict how many and specifically which COSF forms should be entered into the data entry system.</p>	<p><b>Completed</b> Spring 2008</p>	Interagency staff Part C contractors Stakeholders
<p><b>Discussion:</b> During analysis of the FFY 2006 child outcomes data, a discrepancy was discovered between actual numbers of children reported for child outcomes by the service areas compared to the child count in the Michigan Part C data system. Therefore, it will be necessary to develop and implement a process to monitor that all expected child outcomes data are submitted correctly in a timely manner. The switch to using the Michigan Part C data system to collect the child outcomes data should greatly improve the reliability of the data collection.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Clarify definition of and processes for system 'Exit.'</p>	<p><b>Completed</b> Spring 2008</p>	Interagency staff Stakeholders
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Implementation of the child outcomes data collection process has led to many questions about 'Exit' from Part C; clearly defining the term will help improve data in the State data collection system, improve transition and exit practices, and increase the accuracy of the child outcomes data.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Develop procedures that support local early intervention programs to review and 'clean' their data prior to submission.</p>	<p>Spring 2008 Ongoing</p>	Interagency staff Part C contractors
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Analysis of the FFY 2006 child outcomes data indicated there are many data errors that could potentially be identified and corrected locally, rather than after submission to the State contractor. Implementing a process for local review and correction, in conjunction with data cleaning for the entire data set, will inform and improve local child outcomes data collection efforts.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Integrate the recommendations from two committees regarding appropriate assessment tools for eligibility determination and assessment to form a list of recommended tools for local service areas.</p>	<p><b>Completed</b> Spring 2009</p>	Interagency staff Part C contractors Stakeholders

**Discussion:** While two separate committees have convened and made recommendations regarding appropriate, evidence-based developmental assessment tools for both the eligibility determination and child outcomes rating process, the recommendations still need to be reviewed and integrated, followed by development of guidance and implementation.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:**

N/A

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See page 1 of this APR.

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

**Indicator 4:** Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:  
 A. Know their rights;  
 B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs; and  
 C. Help their children develop and learn.  
 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

**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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	A. Families know their rights – 58% B. Families effectively communicate their children’s needs – 53% C. Families help their children develop and learn – 77%

**Actual Data for FFY 2010: A. 59%, B. 54%, C. 78%**

The annual Part C/Early On Family Survey was adapted in FFY 2005 to include the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) “*Impact of Early Intervention Services on Your Family*” Scale and “*Family Centered Service*” Scale, as well as trend items linked with State and Federal priorities. Data for the NCSEAM survey items were sent to Avatar International, LLC (NCSEAM-approved vendor) for analysis and reporting according to SPP requirements.

Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:	FFY 2005 Baseline	FFY 2006 Actual	FFY 2007 Actual	FFY 2008 Actual	FFY 2009 Actual	FFY 2010 Actual
4A: Know their rights.	56% <sup>1</sup> (SE of the mean = 1.0%)	58% <sup>1</sup> (SE of the mean = 0.9%)	56% <sup>1</sup> (SE of the mean = 0.9%)	58% <sup>1</sup> (SE of the mean = 0.9%)	58% <sup>1</sup> (SE of the mean = 0.9%)	59% <sup>1</sup> (SE of the mean = 0.9%)
	[1360 <sup>2</sup> /2439 <sup>3</sup> ] x 100 = 55.8%	[1577 <sup>2</sup> /2703 <sup>3</sup> ] x 100 = 58.3%	[1669 <sup>2</sup> /2969 <sup>3</sup> ] x 100 = 56.2%	[1724 <sup>2</sup> /2981 <sup>3</sup> ] x 100 = 57.8%	[1833 <sup>2</sup> /3163 <sup>3</sup> ] x 100 = 58.0%	[1788 <sup>2</sup> /3051 <sup>3</sup> ] x 100 = 58.6%
4B: Effectively communicate their children's needs.	51% <sup>1</sup> (SE of the mean = 1.0%)	54% <sup>1</sup> (SE of the mean = 1.0%)	51% <sup>1</sup> (SE of the mean = 0.9%)	53% <sup>1</sup> (SE of the mean = 0.9%)	53% <sup>1</sup> (SE of the mean = 0.9%)	54% <sup>1</sup> (SE of the mean = 0.9%)
	[1242 <sup>2</sup> /2439 <sup>3</sup> ] x 100 = 50.9%	[1453 <sup>2</sup> /2703 <sup>3</sup> ] x 100 = 53.8%	[1505 <sup>2</sup> /2969 <sup>3</sup> ] x 100 = 50.7%	[1580 <sup>2</sup> /2981 <sup>3</sup> ] x 100 = 53.0%	[1682 <sup>2</sup> /3163 <sup>3</sup> ] x 100 = 53.2%	[1631 <sup>2</sup> /3051 <sup>3</sup> ] x 100 = 53.5%
4C: Help their children develop and learn.	73% <sup>1</sup> (SE of the mean = 0.9%)	75% <sup>1</sup> (SE of the mean = 0.8%)	72% <sup>1</sup> (SE of the mean = 0.8%)	75% <sup>1</sup> (SE of the mean = 0.8%)	77% <sup>1</sup> (SE of the mean = 0.7%)	78% <sup>1</sup> (SE of the mean = 0.7%)
	[1778 <sup>2</sup> /2439 <sup>3</sup> ] x 100 = 72.9%	[2025 <sup>2</sup> /2703 <sup>3</sup> ] x 100 = 74.9%	[2147 <sup>2</sup> /2969 <sup>3</sup> ] x 100 = 72.3%	[2247 <sup>2</sup> /2981 <sup>3</sup> ] x 100 = 75.4%	[2440 <sup>2</sup> /3163 <sup>3</sup> ] x 100 = 77.1%	[2368 <sup>2</sup> /3051 <sup>3</sup> ] x 100 = 77.6%

<sup>1</sup> Percentage of respondents at or above the Indicator 4 NCSEAM standard score (539 for Indicator 4A, 556 for Indicator 4B and 516 for Indicator 4C). Percent reported for indicators are rounded off.

<sup>2</sup> Number of respondents in the sample at or above the indicator standard score.

<sup>3</sup> Number of respondents with a Rasch score.

Data source: Family Survey, Wayne State University, Center for Urban Studies

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2010:**

This report summarizes the data collected by the State of Michigan *Early On*/Part C Qualitative Compliance Information Project (QCIP) for FFY 2010. It presents the findings from the *Early On* QCIP annual survey to the system's participants. The Family Survey was distributed in March 2011. Out of 7,496 families who received the survey, a total of 3,092 families completed and returned the survey, which provided a response rate of 41.2%. Rasch analysis was used to generate an Impact on Family Scale (IFS) score for **3,051 respondents**; the remaining 41 respondents did not answer a sufficient number of scale items to generate a score. When possible, comparisons are made between the FFY 2010 survey results and those from previous years.

The findings in this report indicate that, overall, the *Early On* system is helping families, despite some challenges. Most respondents continue to report high levels of satisfaction with referrals, assessments, IFSPs, and service coordination.

Major findings from the survey include the following:

- No major changes in referral sources. There were no major shifts in sources of referrals. Hospitals and doctors/nurses accounted for over half of referrals this year (53.0% compared to 53.6% last year). Referrals from public health, intermediate school district, friend or neighbor, child care

provider, and Community Mental Health increased slightly from last year (all increases are within 1%). Referrals from Department of Human Services, family or self, and other sources declined.

- Parents continue to have positive experiences with the assessment process. Over 90% of responding families reported that their input was solicited during the assessment process. The vast majority of respondents (95.4%) agreed that *Early On* staff asked them appropriate questions about the needs of their family and child, and that staff seem to know what they are talking about (94.2%). Families also reported that the assessment process was respectful of their family and culture (94.5%) and that the assessment was completed promptly (92.0%).
- Recognition of initial IFSP meetings remained high, most IFSPs were completed within the 45-day timeline and percent of families who felt satisfaction with recent IFSP meetings was increasing. In spring 2011, 90.1% of respondents indicated they had an IFSP meeting. This is similar with the last two years (90.7% in 2009 and 90.4% in 2010). The percentage of respondents who indicated that their IFSP meeting took place in 45 days or less went up more than two percentage points (72.2% in 2011 and 69.8% in 2010). If families who answered “don’t know/don’t remember” were excluded from the analysis, the percentage increased to 92.9% (almost 2% higher than 91.0% in 2010). There was also an increase in the percent of families reporting satisfaction with their most recent IFSP meeting (91.0% in 2011 and 90.5% in 2010). Similar as last year (83.2% in 2011 and 83.0% in 2010), many families felt that their IFSP has been keeping up with their family’s changing needs. Most families felt that when they mentioned something about their children’s special needs, it was taken into consideration (85.9% in 2011 versus 86.2% in 2010). Compared to last year, more families felt that their concerns about family needs were also attended in the IFSP (82.9% in 2011 versus 80.5% in 2010).
- Decline in knowledge of rights in the IFSP process. The percentage of families who reported they were fully informed of their rights when they agreed to the IFSP process dropped about 2 percentage points from last year (77.3% in 2011, compared to 79.1% in 2010).
- Less frequent IFSP reviews. There was a decrease in reported frequency of IFSP reviews, with 45.3% of 2011 respondents reporting that their IFSP was updated every six months, as compared to 49.4% of 2010.
- Statistically significant increase on recognition of service coordinator. There was a statistically significant increase in the percentage of respondents who recognized having a service coordinator compared to last year (77.2% in 2011 versus 72.2% in 2010). Respondents’ overall satisfaction with service coordination also increased (86.7% in 2011 versus 85.3% in 2010).
- Service providers continue to receive high ratings. As in previous years, the vast majority of respondents reported positive experiences with their service providers. Over 90% of families reported that their service provider was dependable (94.8%), easy to talk to (96.7%), and was good at working with the family (96.0%). Families also felt that their providers supplied them with information and training so they could help their children (90.6%).
- Statistically significant increase in number of families reporting services in settings where children without special needs participate. Percentage of families who reported that their children received services in settings where children without special needs participate increased more than two percentage points compared to last year’s (62.0% in 2011 versus 59.2% in 2010); this was statistically significant. The proportion of respondents who indicated their child received services in the home or wherever their child spent most of his or her time also increased from 85.4% in 2010 to 86.2% in 2011, but this was not a statistically significant increase.

**FFY 2010 Part C State Performance of Indicator 4 (Impact on Family)**

<b>SPP/APR Indicator 4A:</b>	Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family: A. <i>Know their rights</i>
Percent at or above Indicator 4A standard: <b>59%</b> (SE of the mean = 0.9%)	
<b>SPP/APR Indicator 4B:</b>	Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family: B. <i>Effectively communicate their children's needs.</i>
Percent at or above Indicator 4B standard: <b>54%</b> (SE of the mean = 0.9%)	
<b>SPP/APR Indicator 4C:</b>	Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family: C. <i>Help their children develop and learn.</i>
Percent at or above Indicator 4C standard: <b>78%</b> (SE of the mean = 0.7%)	
Number of Valid Responses: 3,051	Mean Measure: 616
Measurement reliability: 0.93	Measurement SD: 156

Source: Avatar International Report

**Five items below represent areas to target for improvement (the numeral in parenthesis is the calibration for that item on the family-centered service scale, based on Rasch analysis):**

- My family was given information about community programs that are open to all children. (623)
- My family was given information about how to advocate for my child and my family. (625)
- My family was given information about organizations that offer support for parents of children with disabilities. (636)
- My family was given information about opportunities for my child to play with other children. (641)
- My family was given information about how to participate in different programs and services in the community. (645)

**Representativeness/Non-Response Bias:**

The survey responses returned are representative of the entire Michigan Part C/*Early On* population based on child gender and length of services received. It was not representative though, based on age, eligibility, or on some racial/ethnic groups. The under-representation of minorities in the Family Survey has been a continuing issue since the surveys were first sent out in 1993. Many strategies have been utilized to increase the number of responses from minorities, including the availability of Spanish and Arabic interpreters, a toll-free number for English and non-English respondents, targeted follow-up mailing, and telephone interviews; further strategies will be examined for future improvement. Detailed descriptions are available through the data collection project at Wayne State University.

See Table 1 below for a summary of respondents' children's demographics, with comparisons to statewide demographics.

Table 1: FFY 2010 - Family Survey Respondents' Child Characteristics Compared to the State

	Family Survey Sample (Current Participants as of Dec. 1, 2010)	Statewide (Current Participants as of Dec 1, 2010)
<i>Gender</i>		
Male	64.5%	63.3%
Female	35.5%	36.7%
<i>Age at Participation</i>		
Birth to 1 year	49.7%	51.9%*
1 to 2 years	35.9%	34.8%
2 to 3 years	14.4%	13.3%
<i>Eligibility</i>		
Part C only	58.7%	64.2%*
MI Special Education	41.3%	35.8%*
<i>Race of Children</i>		
White	76.3%	69.7%*
Black	13.9%	18.4%*
Hispanic	5.0%	7.3%*
Asian	2.1%	1.6%
Native American	0.7%	1.0%
Two or more races	2.0%	2.0%
<i>Length of Services</i>		
Less than a year	75.4%	73.9%
One to two years	21.2%	22.5%
Two to Three years	3.4%	3.6%
Total	n=3,051	N=8,019

\* Difference between sample and statewide population is statistically significant.  $p < .05$

This survey sample represented well for parents of older children based on their proportions in the state intervention population whereas parents of younger children (birth to one) were under-represented (49.7% in the sample compared to 51.9% in the population).

Comparison of the eligibility of respondents' children with the state showed that the percentage of Michigan special education eligible children was higher than the statewide population (41.3% vs. 35.8%, respectively). Also, for Part C only children, the percentage of survey respondents' children (58.7%) was lower than the state percentage (64.2%).

Black children were under-represented in the sample (13.9% survey vs. 18.4% statewide) and so were Hispanic children (5.0% survey vs. 7.3% statewide). White children, on the other hand, were over-represented (76.3% survey vs. 69.7% statewide).

**Description of Weighting Procedure to Adjust for Eligibility and Racial/Ethnic Representation:**

The distribution of age, eligibility, and ethnicity in the survey population was not a perfect representation of the distribution found in the total Part C population. To determine if the difference made a significant impact on the findings related to Indicator 4, weights were applied to adjust the sample sizes for each age, ethnic and eligibility group.

Weights are commonly used to adjust survey results for under- and over-representation of specific subgroups in a sample population. Weighting provides an estimate of the results that would be found if the distribution of the ethnic and eligibility subgroups in the sample were identical to the distribution in the

overall population. The result of weighting is the same as if you duplicated each IFS score by as many times as the weight and then computed the average score.

**Creation of Weights Based on Sample and Population Distribution:**

Weights were calculated by dividing the proportion of each of the subgroups in the Part C population by the corresponding proportion in the sample<sup>1</sup>. For example, in the Part C population the proportion of children identified as white was .697. In the survey sample, the proportion of white children was .763. Dividing .697 by .763 yields 0.91. Therefore, the weight assigned to white children was 0.91. The proportion of Black or African American children in the population was .184 but in the survey sample it was .139, making the weight 1.32. This computation was repeated for the remaining racial and ethnic groups: American Indian, Asian American, Hispanic, and others/multi-racial. The following table indicates the actual weights used in the analysis.

Table 2: Calculation of Weights

	Col A	Col B	Col C	Col D	Col B/Col D
	Population N* (N=8,019)	Proportion of Population	Sample n** (n=3,051)	Proportion of Sample	Weight
<b>Age</b>					
Birth to 1 year	4,164	51.9%	1,515	49.7%	1.04
1 to 2 years	2,792	34.8%	1,096	35.9%	0.97
2 to 3 years	1,063	13.3%	440	14.4%	0.92
<b>Eligibility</b>					
Part C only	5,151	64.2%	1,791	58.7%	1.09
MI Special Education	2,868	35.8%	1,260	41.3%	0.87
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>					
White	5,587	69.7%	2,329	76.3%	0.91
Black	1,474	18.4%	424	13.9%	1.32
Hispanic	582	7.3%	153	5.0%	1.46
Asian	132	1.6%	63	2.1%	0.76
Native American	78	1.0%	20	0.7%	1.43
Two or more races	166	2.0%	62	2.0%	1.00

\* Families currently involved in Part C as of December 1, 2010.

\*\* Includes only respondents with scores on the Impact on Family measure.

The original results and results after weighting are presented in Table 3 below; there is virtually no difference in the scores after weighting. **It suggests that even if the sample is not representative in terms of race/ethnicity and eligibility, it does not measurably affect the Indicator 4 results.**

Table 3: Indicator 4 results before and after weighting

	Un-weighted		Weighted by Age		Weighted by eligibility		Weighted by ethnicity	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
SPP 4A	1,788	<b>58.6%</b>	1,787	<b>58.7%</b>	1,778	<b>58.3%</b>	1,760	<b>57.9%</b>
SPP 4B	1,631	<b>53.5%</b>	1,631	<b>53.6%</b>	1,623	<b>53.2%</b>	1,604	<b>52.7%</b>
SPP 4C	2,368	<b>77.6%</b>	2,364	<b>77.7%</b>	2,361	<b>77.4%</b>	2,349	<b>77.3%</b>
	mean	standard deviation	mean	standard deviation	mean	standard deviation	Mean	standard deviation
Overall Score	616.06	156.50	616.40	156.60	615.34	156.56	614.07	156.15

<sup>1</sup> Children who were eligible for Transition were not included because they were not included in the calculation of Impact scores.

**Progress/Slippage:**

Michigan made progress for FFY 2010 on Indicator 4a, b, and c, and also met the three targets. One reason for this is that a great deal of time was spent learning about Family Outcomes by studying other states' data and improvement activities, taking an in-depth look at Michigan's Family Survey, developing additional activities and strategies to improve our Family Outcomes, and finally adjusting the targets so that they were more realistic.

This process was undertaken by the Parent Involvement Committee (PIC) with additional membership including a Part C-only parent, MDE staff, local Part C coordinators, and Wayne State University staff. This group comprehensively reviewed the targets and improvement activities and then recommended revising the targets, which the MICC and MDE approved. The revised targets are listed in the "Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources" section of the APR. This committee also reviewed the Family Survey and discussed each question to determine if any improvements to the survey could be made that would increase the chance of reaching the State targets. Some improvements included statements in the survey's 'Commonly Asked Questions' document and the cover letter to inform families that if a question does not apply to them, they should leave it blank.

The PIC, MICC, and MDE were reluctant to lower the targets without having an effort made to improve outcomes for families. The PIC was instrumental in moving the Family Navigator grant forward, which was released as an RFP using ARRA funds designed to improve Family Outcomes.

The Family Navigator grant was awarded to a local service area who partnered with the Michigan Alliance for Families to develop a model of a parent/professional partnership at the local level. The hired parent would be responsible to supporting families in *Early On*, providing service coordination, and being a wealth of knowledge regarding available resources in the community. The Family Navigator would also help parents to understand their rights, and be knowledgeable about how *Early On* can help them to communicate their child's needs and help their child develop and learn.

**Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources:**

Improvement Activity	Timelines	Resources
<b>Activity:</b> Collaborate with existing in-state family-focused projects to understand their purpose and outcomes, and maximize their impact on achieving Part C Family Outcomes.	Continuing for 2007-2012	Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) Family Training contractor (Michigan Alliance for Families) <i>Early On</i> Training and Technical Assistance (EOTTA) CSPD contractor PIC QCIP
<p><b>Discussion:</b> A chart was developed to help understand the purpose and outcomes of each existing project and which aspects of <i>Early On</i>'s Family Outcomes the project will help address.</p> <p>The Michigan Alliance for Families was awarded the PTI grant in 2009. Michigan's public awareness contractor, EOTTA, also participates in PIC meetings and discusses opportunities for parent trainings and learning opportunities at their meetings.</p> <p>When requested, QCIP staff attend PIC meetings.</p>		
<b>Activity:</b> Request/review additional analysis of Family Survey data by demographic characteristics (geographical, Part C only vs. enrolled in both Part C and Michigan Special Education; race; age of child; service coordination model in use in local community, etc.), to illustrate any correlations between demographics and higher scores.	Ongoing as annual survey results are received	QCIP Avatar International, Inc. PIC Interagency staff

# APR Template – Part C (4)

<p><b>Discussion:</b> Wayne State University (WSU) shared an analysis of demographic data with the PIC in March 2007. The data did exhibit differences among service area peer groups as well as for children who are Part C only; however, additional years of data must be analyzed to develop more targeted improvement activities. The committee will continue to analyze data from the annual survey.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Analyze what other states that report high impact of early intervention are doing regarding Family Outcomes, including how much of their state budget is committed to achieving each family outcome, and what it is purchasing.</p>	<p>Ongoing through 2012</p>	<p>PTI and PTI Network Early Intervention Family Alliance RRCs NECTAC ECO Center PIC Interagency staff</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The analysis was completed but did not yield information that would be helpful to changing practice. MDE will gather information from other states that report high levels of success with Family Outcomes. MDE will also review results from other states that use the NCSEAM survey and the ECO Family Survey to look at differences and outcomes. This work is continuing through the PIC.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Use results of additional analysis/data gathering/research review to guide development of a list of promising practices to consider implementing in upcoming years.</p>	<p>Ongoing through June 2011</p>	<p>PIC Interagency staff Part C contractors</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> In FFY 2009, an RFP was released to allow local early intervention programs to create a module that trains and hires parents as service coordinators/liaisons.</p> <p>In March 2010, the RFP was awarded to Washtenaw ISD, who worked closely with the Michigan Alliance for Families (parent support contractor) to develop a Family Navigator model that could be replicated across the state. The Family Navigator would serve as a service coordinator/liaison for families of children in the early intervention system.</p> <p>Pilots were done in three areas across the state. Numerous trainings provided the Family Navigators with the knowledge needed to work with other parents, and included <i>Early On</i> 101 training, procedural safeguards training, community involvement training, community resource identification and referral, family support and advocacy training.</p> <p>The model was tested in Washtenaw County and will be presented at the <i>Early On</i> Conference in November 2011. The Family Navigator model will be completed by September 30, 2011.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Ensure that any projects involved in collecting Family Outcomes data for Part C are advised by and responsive to an advisory body of Part C parents.</p>	<p>Ongoing through 2012</p>	<p>Part C Administrative structure MICC PIC</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The PIC reviews materials surrounding this indicator for many of the Mandated Activities Projects as well as RFPs.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Add item(s) to Family Survey to gather family input on approximately how many hours/month they are involved in <i>Early On</i> activities that help to achieve the three Family Outcomes.</p>	<p>Ongoing through 2012</p>	<p>QCIP PIC Family Outcomes Committee</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> In FFY 2009, the PIC expanded its membership to include a Part C only parent, MDE staff, local Part C coordinators and WSU staff for the purpose of reviewing the Family Outcome targets and activities. The newly formed workgroup is the Family Outcomes Committee. This workgroup reviewed the Family Survey, question by question, and gave advice to WSU about the items. With insightful advice from Part C coordinators, the length of the survey will not be changed in an effort to allow local ISDs to review longitudinal data for each question.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Assess impact of implementation plan; develop and implement new activities as needed.</p>	<p>Ongoing through 2012</p>	<p>Interagency staff PIC</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Since FFY 2008, there has been a designated staff to see that activities are updated and evaluated on a regular basis. MDE has identified the MICC liaison to oversee the implementation plan and review activities regularly.</p> <p>The MICC liaison continues to work with the committee and MDE to assure all issues are addressed. A Family Outcomes ladder was developed to serve as a visual for the committee to better understand the NCSEAM survey and Rasch analysis. The ladder also helps the committee see exactly where Michigan's data are for Indicators 4a, b, and c.</p>		

# APR Template – Part C (4)

<p><b>Activity:</b> Develop and deliver a presentation to increase parent and provider understanding of the Family Survey results, particularly the NCSEAM results (how it works, what the data mean, etc.).</p>	<p>Ongoing through 2012</p>	<p>CSPD contractor Family Training contractor PTI contractor QCIP</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> While State interagency staff and members of the PIC have a better understanding of the NCSEAM survey and how to interpret the results, there is a need to extend this information sharing and improve understanding for other State ICC members and to providers, families, and ICC members in local service areas.</p> <p>In FFY 2008, Wayne State University (QCIP) went to four locations across the state and one MICC meeting to explain, share, and discuss the Family Survey and its results; as well as the impact the results have on the early intervention system in Michigan.</p> <p>In FFY 2009, QCIP joined the newly formed Family Outcomes Committee to help parents and others understand the process used to gather data through the Family Survey. QCIP also presented at the Part C/<i>Early On</i> Annual Conference in October 2010 and at the November 2010 MICC meeting and shared and interpreted the most recent Family Survey data.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Analyze return rate by service area, as well as mean score and range of scores; send results to each local service area.</p>	<p>Ongoing through 2012</p>	<p>QCIP Local Service Areas</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Individual service areas are able to analyze their Family Outcomes results and identify areas for improvement.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Review data with service areas and existing in-state, family-focused projects to plan improvement activities to help achieve Part C Family Outcomes.</p>	<p>Ongoing through 2012</p>	<p>NCRRC IT Kit materials QCIP CSPD contractor Family Training contractor PTI contractor</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Beyond expanding the understanding of the NCSEAM survey, there is a need to help local service areas and the family support projects understand how they can use the survey results and results of the analysis of “promising practices” to help identify their own improvement activities related to Family Outcomes.</p> <p>In October 2010, the Pre-Day session of the <i>Early On</i> conference was designed for Part C coordinators, focusing on Family Outcomes. Information was shared about research related to supporting Family Outcomes, current State initiatives underway regarding Family Outcomes, and round table discussions occurred. Ideas generated from the session have been shared with the PIC/Family Outcomes Committee.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Develop a reference bulletin for improving Family Outcomes related to Family Survey results.</p>	<p>Spring 2009-2012</p>	<p>CSPD contractor Family Training contractor Interagency staff PIC Family Outcomes Committee</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> While Michigan has historically valued parent involvement and surveyed parents to determine their view of <i>Early On</i>, guidance on improving Family Outcomes has not been developed. This guidance will help service areas develop activities based on their local analysis of data to improve results for their families.</p> <p>After the Family Outcomes RFPs (Family Navigator and Climb to the Top) are completed, the reference bulletin will be developed.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Determine means to create parent peer mentors or parent-to-parent models, especially related to service coordination and personnel standards.</p>	<p>Fall 2008-2012</p>	<p>Family Training contractor PTI contractor</p>

# APR Template – Part C (4)

<p><b>Discussion:</b> The PIC identified these strategies as the most likely to increase the impact of <i>Early On</i> services as they relate to Family Outcomes.</p> <p>In FFY 2009, an RFP was released to allow local early intervention programs to create a module that trains and hires parents as service coordinators/liaisons.</p> <p>In March 2010, the RFP was awarded to Washtenaw ISD, who worked closely with the Michigan Alliance for Families (parent support contractor) to develop a Family Navigator model that could be replicated across the state. The Family Navigator would serve as a service coordinator/liaison for families of children in the early intervention system.</p> <p>Pilots were done in three areas across the state. Numerous trainings provided the Family Navigators with the knowledge needed to work with other parents, and included <i>Early On</i> 101 training, procedural safeguards training, community involvement training, community resource identification and referral, family support and advocacy training.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Perform analysis demonstrating convergent validity of NCSEAM Family Survey results and other APR data as well as results from other sections of the Family Survey.</p>	<p>Ongoing through 2012</p>	<p>Family Survey Data Collection contractor PIC Family Outcomes Committee</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The Family Outcomes Committee compared data from Michigan and other states using the NCSEAM survey and the Rasch analysis. As a result, the targets were revised, and ideas for new improvement activities were discussed. Improvement activities will be discussed and implemented in 2011-2012.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Evaluate means to increase response rate for subgroups responding to the Family Survey, as identified through analysis and results.</p>	<p>Ongoing through 2012</p>	<p>Family Survey Data Collection contractor</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The survey responses returned in 2010-2011 are representative of the entire Michigan Part C/<i>Early On</i> population based on child gender, age, and length of services received. The responses were not representative, based on eligibility or on some racial/ethnic groups. The under-representation of minorities in the Family Survey has been a continuing issue since the surveys were first sent out in 1993. Many strategies have been utilized to increase the number of responses from minorities, including the availability of Spanish and Arabic interpreters, a toll-free number for English and non-English respondents, targeted follow-up mailing, and telephone interviews; further strategies will be examined for future improvement.</p> <p>To determine if the difference made a significant impact on the findings related to Indicator 4, weights were applied to adjust the sample size for each ethnic and eligibility group. A detailed description of the weighting process is explained as part of this Indicator. There is virtually no difference in the scores after weighting. It suggests that even if the sample is not representative in terms of race/ethnicity and eligibility, it does not measurably affect Indicator 4 results.</p>		

## Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

Improvement Activity	Timelines	Resources
<p><b>Activity:</b> The PTI grantee, Michigan Alliance for Families, will create and disseminate mini-folders to parents whose children are enrolled in Part C.</p>	<p>2010-2012</p>	<p>Michigan PTI grantee PIC MDE staff</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Mini-folders were developed for the following topics: IFSP, Natural Environments, Family Rights, and Transition. Mini-folders will be shared with parents in small groups in informal gatherings, allowing time to answer questions and explain the materials. This activity replicates the support provided to Part B families.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> The <i>Early On</i> Guidebooks will be revised.</p>	<p>2009-2012</p>	<p>Public Awareness grantee State Interagency staff PIC Center for Education Networking</p>

<p><b>Discussion:</b> Due to the change in eligibility implemented in 2010-2011, the <i>Early On</i> Guidebook will be updated and available in a variety of formats for families. The new Regulations will be taken into account when updating the Guidebook.</p> <p>The committee will continue to meet and work to complete the Guidebook. A blog was created to share information, increase communication, and provide updates to <i>Early On</i> Coordinators about the progress of the process.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Public awareness activities will be developed to help families understand their rights.</p>	<p>2010-2012</p>	<p>Public Awareness grantee State Interagency staff PIC Center for Education Networking Michigan Alliance for Families <i>Early On</i> Coordinators</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> A variety of materials will be developed and shared with families to help them better understand their rights for Part C.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Develop a statewide, unified approach to supporting families.</p>	<p>2010-2012</p>	<p>MDE DHS DCH</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Representatives from MDE, DCH and DHS will work on developing key objectives for each agency that serves young children and families. This plan will be shared with all involved and implemented.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Family Outcome targets were revised for 2010 and set for 2011 and 2012.</p>	<p>2010-2012</p>	<p>MDE Family Outcomes Committee MICC</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The targets for 2010-2012 are as follows:</p> <p>FFY 2010 -- SPP4A: 58%, SPP4B: 53%, SPP4C: 77% FFY 2011 -- SPP4A: 58.2%, SPP4B: 53.2%, SPP4C: 77.2% FFY 2012 -- SPP4A: 58.4%, SPP4B: 53.4%, SPP4C: 77.4%</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Release an RFP, titled <i>Climb to the Top</i>, to improve Family Outcomes on a statewide level.</p>	<p>2010-2012</p>	<p>MDE</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The Climb to the Top RFP was awarded to the Michigan Alliance for Families. Its purpose was to develop and share activities and strategies designed to improve Family Outcomes as stated in the SPP/APR, Indicator 4 for Part C. This grant was awarded under Part C of the IDEA, American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds. The Climb to the Top grant will end September 30, 2011, and will be reported on in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>		

**Continuous Improvement Visit, Results Component:**

On December 1, 2011, the Office of Special Education Programs visited Michigan to learn of the State’s efforts and share ideas for improving Family Outcomes. The day began with members of the PIC sharing the history of Family Outcomes in Michigan. Their presentation gave an overview of the PIC activities, how the original targets were set, the past and current data, how the data were evaluated, ideas for improvement, and future activities.

Wayne State University presented information on APR Indicator 4. It focused on targets and results and how family impact differs by child/family characteristics.

The Climb to the Top grantee shared information on products developed to help parents better understand their rights, effectively communicate their child’s needs, and help their child develop and learn.

The Family Navigator grantee explained its piloted model conducted in three areas around the state with the goal of training parents to become service coordinators and mentors to other families in *Early On*.

The final presentation was given by Macomb County ISD on how child and family outcomes are woven throughout all of their work and printed documents. Strategies used by Macomb included focus groups, data analysis of State and local surveys, a Facebook page, and staff development, and have all been tied

## APR Template – Part C (4)

to family outcomes. They learned that communication and relationships are the key to effective support for children and families.

The afternoon was spent in small groups that worked on what should be the focus in order for *Early On* to be successful. The small groups shared their ideas, which became the future improvement activities for Indicator 4 of the APR and are listed below.

### Improvement Activities:

<b>Activity:</b> Develop probing questions to be included in the Continuous Improvement Monitoring System workbook.	2011-2012	MDE PIC Focus group of <i>Early On</i> Coordinators
<b>Discussion:</b> The CIMS workbook is a tool used by local service areas to submit data to MDE. In the past, it was used for Compliance Indicators of the APR, but with a greater focus on Family Outcomes, this tool will be a systematic way to ensure family survey data is being reviewed and evaluated each year.		
<b>Activity:</b> Explore the concept of Scaling Up for Climb to the Top and Family Navigator.	2011-2013	MDE PIC Scaling Up consultants
<b>Discussion:</b> The PIC will meet with Scaling Up consultants to braid the two projects and make them available statewide.		
<b>Activity:</b> Learn from ISDs that are meeting targets to understand why and how to help other ISDs improve Family Outcomes.	2011-2014	MDE PIC ISDs Wayne State University
<b>Discussion:</b> Data will be reviewed to learn which ISDs are meeting their targets and interviews would take place to learn of best practices being implemented in those "pockets of excellence."		
<b>Activity:</b> Evaluate all improvement activities annually and change those that are not working.	2011-2016	MDE PIC
<b>Discussion:</b> The PIC will focus on all activities to see if they are effective in achieving Family Outcomes.		
<b>Activity:</b> Explore and identify additional sources of <i>Early On</i> data related to Family Outcomes.	2012-2016	MDE PIC MICC
<b>Discussion:</b> A workgroup will brainstorm additional sources of data that could be used to measure Family Outcomes.		
<b>Activity:</b> Explore the relationship Service Coordination has on Family Outcomes.	2012-2016	MDE Universities Center for Higher Education MICC PIC
<b>Discussion:</b> Determine if the model of service coordination makes a difference for family outcomes, define effective service coordination, and analyze current service areas' performances on effective service coordination. Review/revise service coordinator training and work towards building a new service coordinator culture that includes reflective practices and relationship building.		

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

See page 1 of this APR.

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

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

**Measurement:**

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	1.24%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2010: 1.28%**

The percent of children birth to 1 served in Michigan for FFY 2010 was **1.28%**. The 57 local early intervention programs served a snapshot total of 1,468 children aged birth to 1 on December 1, 2010, while the number of births in 2010 was 114,751.

Percent served, birth to 1								
	FFY 2003	FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006	FFY 2007	FFY 2008	FFY 2009	FFY 2010
Michigan	1.0%	1.1%	1.03%	1.08%	1.08%	1.15%	1.24%	1.28%
National	0.9%	0.9%	0.95%	1.04%	1.06%	1.04%	1.03%	1.03%

Data sources: Michigan Part C 618 Data System annual December collection; Michigan Birth Registry Data 2010; IDEA data charts; U.S. Census Bureau

**Related Data**

Referral Source	FFY 2002	FFY 2003	FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006	FFY 2007	FFY 2008	FFY 2009	FFY 2010
Education	74	56	74	76	72	82	104	143	120
Family	95	159	175	184	191	131	144	210	216
Health Dept.	227	240	222	221	201	104	98	181	136
Hospitals	517	543	597	532	568	391	329	406	406
Mental Health	16	13	13	7	7	4	12	12	23
Other	151	100	110	108	145	112	50	85	70
Physicians	30	66	73	109	75	76	71	94	88
Social Services	43	33	83	95	112	94	155	222	248
Unknown	145	208	139	87	104	474	437	185	161
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,298</b>	<b>1,418</b>	<b>1,486</b>	<b>1,419</b>	<b>1,475</b>	<b>1,468</b>	<b>1,400</b>	<b>1,538</b>	<b>1,468</b>

Data source: Michigan Part C 618 Data System annual December collection

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2010:**

**Progress/Slippage:**

Michigan identified 1.28% of birth to one year olds and reached the target of 1.24%. According to the U.S. Census Bureau data from 2010, Michigan was the only state in the nation to experience a population decrease (0.6%) while the nation increased in population by 9.7%.

Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) legislation now requires all children with cases of substantiated abuse or neglect be referred to early intervention. This law has resulted in an increased number of referrals to *Early On*. However, the referrals do not always result in eligibility although more staff time is needed to process referrals and provide a comprehensive evaluation.

Prior to July 1, 2010, Michigan’s eligibility criterion served children with any level of delay in any area of development and children with an established medical condition with a significant possibility of a delay. Michigan sent a new eligibility definition to OSEP in May 2009, and it was approved. Michigan’s eligibility definition, effective July 1, 2010, is:

Developmental delay is defined as follows:

Age	Percent Delay
Up to 2 months* old	Any delay
2-36* months old	20 percent delay in one or more areas of development (or a score of one standard deviation below the mean)

\*adjust for prematurity through chronological age of 24 months

Despite the population decrease and difficult economic picture, many improvement activities are being implemented and continued to increase the number of infants and toddlers eligible for *Early On* as child identification continues to be a priority for local service areas.

**Improvement Activities:**

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
<b>Activity:</b> The <i>Early On</i> system will develop and implement a joint policy for the MDE and DHS responding to CAPTA and IDEA legislation for referral of all children substantiated for abuse and neglect.	Ongoing through 2012	Ad Hoc subcommittee of the MICC DHS CSPD Contractor
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The CAPTA Ad Hoc workgroup completed its work and made recommendations regarding CAPTA referrals during the FFY 2010 reporting period. The recommendation was to refer all victims of children in category one or two cases based on a preponderance of evidence of abuse/neglect. The DHS initiated an automatic referral process with statewide rollout in January 2008. The DHS will review the data with regard to the number of referrals that are generated in FFY 2007 to determine if the automated referral has an impact on increasing the numbers of children found eligible for Part C.</p> <p>Additionally, the DHS has updated its policy with regard to CAPTA and <i>Early On</i> and the approved policy is planned to go into effect in January 2008. It will provide additional guidance to local DHS workers regarding the interactions between DHS and <i>Early On</i>. The CAPTA policy went into effect January 2008.</p> <p>DHS continues to train staff on the joint policy. In addition, an ad hoc committee met in FFY 2010 and discussed issues related to CAPTA referrals. Issues include lack of referrals, difficulty finding the child, and keeping the information updated. DHS will review all information before it is sent to the local districts. DHS is working with <i>Early On</i> Training and Technical Assistance, the CSPD contractor, to eliminate the issue of duplicate referrals entering the system. The CSPD contractor also printed the <i>Your Child Has Been Referred</i> brochure to help with outreach to families.</p> <p>Local DHS offices are using the manual and continuing training.</p>		

# APR Template – Part C (4)

<p><b>Activity:</b> The Eligible Population Task Force will review the eligibility definition, conducting a prevalence study and reviewing Michigan's eligibility process.</p>	<p>Completed  Ongoing training through 2012</p>	<p>Eligible Population Task Force CSPD contractor</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The Eligibility Population Task Force, formed as a part of Redesign, has reviewed and taken public comment regarding Michigan's Part C eligibility definition. The proposed definition sets eligibility for infants under two months adjusted age at any level of delay with re-determination within six months, and eligibility for children over two months adjusted age with a 20% delay in one or more areas of development. After the reporting period, the proposed changes to Michigan's Part C eligibility went out for public hearing in November 2007. After consideration of public comment, if Michigan decides to go forward with the change in eligibility, formal OSEP approval will be requested before implementation.</p> <p>Michigan submitted the new definition of eligibility to OSEP in May 2009 and it was accepted. Training and technical assistance to the local early intervention programs about the new eligibility definition began in 2009 and full implementation began in July 2010.</p> <p>From February through June 2010, the CSPD contractor provided training on the new eligibility definition to 362 staff in 11 ISDs around the state as well as online. The trainings were focused on the new eligibility criteria and calculating percent delay.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> The Michigan Part C data system will be upgraded to ensure timely and accurate collection of utilization, outcome, and cost data for <i>Early On</i>.</p>	<p>2006 – 2012  Ongoing</p>	<p>Part C Administrative Structure Michigan Part C data system contractor</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Enhancements to the data collection system were made so that all data needed for the APR could be obtained through the State data system.</p> <p>The Michigan Part C data system was upgraded to include additional components necessary to collect accurate data for all compliance indicators.</p> <p>Beginning in the fall of 2012, OSE will be decommissioning the MI-CIS data system and moving to the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) which will allow a more uniform system of data collection. Part C relies heavily on MI-CIS for data collection that is required for the SPP and APR and other Federal reporting. The State Part C Coordinator will be meeting with the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) that manages the MSDS to discuss the required Part C data needed to assure Federal compliance.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Analyze data measuring this indicator and develop additional improvement activities.</p>	<p>Ongoing with annual review through 2012</p>	<p>Interagency staff Part C contractors MICC Stakeholders</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> As evidenced in the APR, analysis of data from multiple sources related to the SPP indicators has led to the development of additional, more targeted, improvement activities.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Analyze effect of the electronic CAPTA referral system.</p>	<p>Ongoing through 2012</p>	<p>Public awareness contractor DHS staff</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Preliminary analysis indicates a need to drill down and identify system barriers and reasons for an increase in referrals not leading to eligibility.</p> <p>To learn more about the referrals not leading to eligibility, the <i>Early On</i> Coordinators were surveyed through Survey Monkey. One reason the referrals were not leading to eligibility was because the referral form was incomplete, missing contact information for the family. To eliminate the frustration of not being able to contact the family, the referral form is held at the DHS Central Office until the form is complete. It is then given to the local service area to follow up on the referral. Training at the local DHS office is occurring to ensure the referral form is complete.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Implement additional public awareness strategies as developed by the public awareness and referral information contractor.</p>	<p>Ongoing through 2012</p>	<p>Public awareness contractor MDE grant manager</p>

**Discussion:**

From July 1, 2009, to June 30, 2010, the following strategies and activities were implemented:

- Through the 1-800-Early On phone line, referred over 6000 children to local ISDs.
- Convened a workgroup to revise/condense existing *Early On* Guidebooks to streamline information and incorporate information regarding the Child and Family Outcomes. The workgroup consisted of members from the Public Awareness grantee, State Interagency staff, the Parent Involvement Committee, the Center for Education Networking, the Michigan Alliance for Families, and *Early On*. The redesigned guidebooks will use New Mexico’s FIT (Family Infant Toddler) Program book as a model.
- Updated the Child Developmental Wheel and the “*Baby Steps*” poster to align with the new design/layout and look of the *Early On* Guidebooks.
- Compiled the 2008-09 *Early On* Michigan Central Directory for Infants and Toddlers.
- Placed *Early On* advertisements in the Metro Parent and Metro Baby publications. Each had an e-Book link provided on the [www.1800EarlyOn.org](http://www.1800EarlyOn.org) website.
- Collaboration continued with the Family-to-Family Health and Information Workgroup/Public Awareness to strengthen outreach amongst partners, parents, and children with special needs and/or supports.
- The statewide *Early On* display board was taken and displayed at 16 different conferences around the state throughout the year. This effort targeted primary referral sources.
- Public awareness staff attended many professional development opportunities to enhance their knowledge.
- The “Don’t Worry But Don’t Wait” presentation was shared at numerous events and conferences around the state.
- Public awareness outreach was provided at numerous conferences, workshops and trainings around the state and 390 folders were distributed at these events.
- Developed an E-Store and offered promotional products/materials for local *Early On* service areas to purchase.
- Implemented Social Networking initiatives including the creation of a Twitter account to provide other systems and coordinators with up-to-date information about *Early On*/Child Find, the creation of a Facebook page to increase awareness, networking, and information sharing amongst stakeholders.
- Created a YouTube *Early On* Michigan Channel which hosts the Public Service Announcements in English and Spanish.
- Created a **SlideShare Channel for *Early On* Michigan** which hosts the past four years of *Early On* Public Awareness and Project Find Michigan presentations provided at conferences. SlideShare acts as a platform to host presentations and related documents in an engaged format.

<p><b>Activity:</b> Continue to work with the Michigan Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) on Assuring Better Child Health and Development (ABCD) grant to improve universal developmental screening at well child visits.</p>	<p>Completed</p> <p>Ongoing through 2012</p>	<p>DCH – Medicaid Michigan Chapter of the AAP CSPD Contractor</p>
--	--	---

**Discussion:** The ABCD Project promotes the use of an objective developmental screening tool as part of well-child care. The target population is infants and toddlers, age birth to three who are eligible for Medicaid. A pilot study was done in nine pediatric practices and data from the first six months looks promising for identifying children who are eligible for early intervention services.

Continue collaboration with the ABCD initiative through the provision of resources and supports.

In collaboration with the ABCD Project, a workgroup was developed and met several times throughout 2009 with the Michigan Chapter of the AAP and DCH to streamline the referral process for primary care providers.

In FFY 2010, DCH received money from the Early Childhood Investment Corporation to continue to train physicians on using standardized developmental screening tools at well-child visits, and in how to make the appropriate community linkage for the child who is demonstrating concerns. They will continue to work with the Michigan Chapter of the AAP and Michigan Academy of Family Physicians to train physicians on tools such as the ASQ and ASQ SE and encourage social-emotional as well as developmental screening. The goal is to increase the number of children aged 0-3 years who are identified as potentially needing EI services, especially birth to one year olds, and should be referred for further evaluation.

# APR Template – Part C (4)

## Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010

<b>Activity:</b> The percent of infants and toddlers served, age birth to one, targets were revised for 2010 and set for 2011 and 2012.	2010-2012	MDE MICC
<b>Discussion:</b> FFY 2010           Target- 1.24% FFY 2011           Target- 1.24% FFY 2012           Target- 1.24%		
<b>Justification:</b> The extension of the APR format and guidance from the MICC resulted in the new targets. After the review of data, the discussion resulted in setting more realistic targets. The MICC recommended setting a lower target to encourage local programs to continue current activities.		

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See page 1 of this APR.

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

**Indicator 6:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.  
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:**

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	2.7%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2010: 2.96%**

The percent of children birth to three years of age served in Michigan for FFY 2010 was **2.96%**. The 57 service areas served a snapshot total of 10,384 children aged birth to three years old on December 1, 2010. The total number of children age birth-three for 2010 was 350,984. The total number of births for 2008-2010 was 366,391.

Percent served, birth to 3								
	FFY 2003	FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006	FFY 2007	FFY 2008	FFY 2009	FFY 2010
Michigan	2.1%	2.2%	2.2%	2.30%	2.44%	2.67%	2.88%	2.96%
National	2.18%	2.2%	2.34%	2.43%	2.52%	2.66%	2.67%	2.82%

Data sources: Michigan Part C 618 Data System, annual December collection; Michigan Birth Registry 2010; IDEA Data Charts; U.S. Census Bureau

**Related Data**

Referral Source	FFY 2002	FFY 2003	FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006	FFY 2007	FFY 2008	FFY 2009	FFY 2010
Education	1,187	1,234	1,312	1,301	1,281	883	1,098	2,258	2,548
Family	2,089	3,134	3,390	3,740	4,047	2,043	3,004	4,500	5,108
Health Dept	1,983	1,976	1,966	1,954	2,074	898	760	1,346	1,415
Hospital	2,771	2,680	2,986	3,030	3,045	1,807	1,873	2,211	2,268
Mental Health	171	154	161	126	105	47	70	448	669
Other	2,121	1,556	1,600	1,527	1,614	1,766	731	1,286	1,334
Physician	643	1,073	1,514	1,948	2,209	1,099	1,924	2,589	2,549
Social Services	538	426	561	752	896	512	820	1,412	1,743
Unknown	2,042	2,349	1,997	1,481	1,460	8,709	8,382	3,866	2,601
<b>Total</b>	<b>13,545</b>	<b>14,582</b>	<b>15,487</b>	<b>15,859</b>	<b>16,731</b>	<b>17,764</b>	<b>18,662</b>	<b>19,916</b>	<b>20,235</b>

Data source: Michigan Part C 618 Data System, annual December collection

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2010:**

**Progress/Slippage:**

Michigan exceeded the target of 2.7% birth to three year olds served by identifying and serving 2.96%, utilizing population data from the U.S. Census Bureau. Furthermore, Michigan was the only state in the nation to experience a population decrease (0.6%) while the nation increased population by 9.7%.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) legislation now requires all children with cases of substantiated abuse or neglect be referred to early intervention. This law has resulted in an increased number of referrals to *Early On*.

Prior to July 1, 2010, Michigan’s eligibility criterion served children with any level of delay in any area of development and children with an established medical condition. Michigan sent a new eligibility definition to OSEP in May 2009, and it was approved. Michigan’s eligibility definition, effective July 1, 2010, is:

Developmental delay is defined as follows:

Age	Percent Delay
Up to 2 months* old	Any delay
2-36* months old	20 percent delay in one or more areas of development (or a score of one standard deviation below the mean)

\*adjust for prematurity through chronological age of 24 months

Despite the population decrease and difficult economic picture, many activities are being implemented and continued to increase the number of infants and toddlers eligible for *Early On* as child identification continues to be a priority for local service areas.

**Improvement Activities:**

The following activities were included in the FFY 2009 APR and in the SPP that was updated in February 2010. An update on the progress of each activity is included.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
<p><b>Activity:</b> The <i>Early On</i> system will develop a joint policy for the MDE and DHS responding to CAPTA and IDEA legislation for referral of all children substantiated for abuse and neglect.</p>	Ongoing through 2012	Ad Hoc subcommittee of the MICC DHS CSPD Contractor
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The CAPTA Ad Hoc workgroup completed its work and made recommendations regarding CAPTA referrals during the FFY 2010 reporting period. The recommendation was to refer all victims of children in category one or two cases based on a preponderance of evidence of abuse/neglect. The DHS initiated an automatic referral process with statewide rollout in January 2008. The DHS will review the data with regard to the number of referrals that are generated in FFY 2007 to determine if the automated referral has an impact on increasing the numbers of children found eligible for Part C.</p> <p>Additionally, the DHS updated its policy with regard to CAPTA and <i>Early On</i> and the approved policy is planned to go into effect in January 2008. It will provide additional guidance to local DHS workers regarding the interactions between DHS and <i>Early On</i>. The CAPTA policy went into effect January 2008.</p> <p>DHS continues to train staff on the joint policy. In addition, an ad hoc committee met and discussed issues related to CAPTA referrals. Issues include lack of referrals, difficulty finding the child, and keeping the information updated. DHS will review all information before it is sent to the local districts. DHS is working with <i>Early On</i> Training and Technical Assistance, the CSPD contractor, to eliminate the issue of duplicate referrals entering the system. The CSPD contractor also printed the <i>Your Child Has Been Referred</i> brochure to help with outreach to families.</p>		

# APR Template – Part C (4)

Local DHS offices are using the manual and continuing training.		
<b>Activity:</b> The Eligible Population Task Force will review the eligibility definition, conducting a prevalence study and reviewing Michigan's eligibility process.	Ongoing training through 2012	Eligible Population Task Force CSPD contractor
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The Eligible Population Task Force, formed as a part of Redesign, has reviewed and taken public comment regarding Michigan's Part C eligibility definition. The proposed definition sets eligibility for infants under two months adjusted age at any level of delay with re-determination within six months, and eligibility for children over two months adjusted age with a 20% delay in one or more areas of development. After the reporting period, the proposed changes to Michigan's Part C eligibility went out for public hearing in November 2007. After consideration of public comment, if Michigan decides to go forward with the change in eligibility, formal OSEP approval will be requested before implementation.</p> <p>Michigan submitted the new definition of eligibility to OSEP in May 2009 and it was accepted. Training and technical assistance to the local early intervention programs about the new eligibility definition began in 2009 and full implementation began in July 2010.</p> <p>From February through June 2010, the CSPD contractor provided training on the new eligibility definition to 362 staff in 11 ISDs around the state as well as online. The trainings were focused on the new eligibility criteria and calculating percent delay.</p>		
<b>Activity:</b> The Michigan Part C data system will be upgraded to ensure timely and accurate collection of utilization, outcome, and cost data for <i>Early On</i> .	Ongoing through 2012	Part C Administrative Structure Michigan Part C data system contractor
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Enhancements to the data collection system were made so that all data needed for the APR could be obtained through the State data system.</p> <p>The Michigan Part C data system was upgraded to include additional components necessary to collect accurate data for all compliance indicators.</p> <p>Beginning in the fall of 2012, OSE will be decommissioning the MI-CIS data system and moving to the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) which will allow them a more uniform system of data collection. Part C relies heavily on MI-CIS for data collection that is required for the SPP and APR and other Federal reporting. The State Part C Coordinator will meet with the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) that manages the MSDS to discuss the required Part C data needed to assure Federal compliance.</p>		
<b>Activity:</b> Analyze data measuring this indicator and develop additional improvement activities.	Ongoing with annual review through 2012	Interagency staff Part C contractors MICC Stakeholders
<b>Discussion:</b> As evidenced in the APR, analysis of data from multiple sources related to the SPP indicators has led to the development of additional, more targeted, improvement activities.		
<b>Activity:</b> Analyze effect of the electronic CAPTA referral system.	Ongoing through 2012	Public awareness contractor DHS staff
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Preliminary analysis indicates a need to drill down and identify system barriers and reasons for an increase in referrals not leading to eligibility.</p> <p>To learn more about the referrals not leading to eligibility, the <i>Early On</i> Coordinators were surveyed through Survey Monkey. One reason the referrals were not leading to eligibility was because the referral form was incomplete, missing contact information for the family. To eliminate the frustration of not being able to contact the family, the referral form is held at the DHS Central Office until the form is complete. It is then given to the local service area to follow up on the referral. Training at the local DHS office is occurring to ensure the referral form is complete.</p>		
<b>Activity:</b> Implement additional public awareness strategies as developed by the public awareness and referral information contractor.	Ongoing through 2012	Public awareness contractor MDE grant manager

<p><b>Discussion:</b> From July 1, 2009, to June 30, 2010, the following strategies and activities were implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Through the 1-800-Early On phone line, referred over 6,000 children to local ISDs.</li> <li>• Convened a workgroup to revise/condense existing <i>Early On</i> Guidebooks to streamline information and incorporate information regarding the Child and Family Outcomes. The workgroup consisted of members from the Public Awareness grantee, State Interagency staff, the Parent Involvement Committee, the Center for Education Networking, the Michigan Alliance for Families, and <i>Early On</i>. The redesigned guidebooks will use New Mexico's FIT (Family Infant Toddler) Program book as a model.</li> <li>• Updated the Child Developmental Wheel and the "<i>Baby Steps</i>" poster to align with the new design/layout and look of the <i>Early On</i> Guidebooks.</li> <li>• Compiled the 2008-09 <i>Early On</i> Michigan Central Directory for Infants and Toddlers.</li> <li>• Placed <i>Early On</i> advertisements in the Metro Parent and Metro Baby publications. Each had an e-Book link provided on the <a href="http://www.1800EarlyOn.org">www.1800EarlyOn.org</a> website.</li> <li>• Collaboration continued with the Family-to-Family Health and Information Workgroup/Public Awareness to strengthen outreach amongst partners, parents, and children with special needs and/or supports.</li> <li>• The statewide <i>Early On</i> display board was taken and displayed at 16 different conferences around the state throughout the year. This effort targeted primary referral sources.</li> <li>• Public awareness staff attended many professional development opportunities to enhance their knowledge.</li> <li>• The "Don't Worry But Don't Wait" presentation was shared at numerous events and conferences around the state.</li> <li>• Public awareness outreach was provided at numerous conferences, workshops and trainings around the state and 390 folders were distributed at these events.</li> <li>• Developed an E-Store and offered promotional products/materials for local <i>Early On</i> service areas to purchase.</li> <li>• Implemented Social Networking initiatives including the creation of a Twitter account to provide other systems and coordinators with up-to-date information about <i>Early On</i>/Child Find, the creation of a Facebook page to increase awareness, networking, and information sharing amongst stakeholders.</li> <li>• Created a YouTube <i>Early On</i> Michigan Channel which hosts the Public Service Announcements in English and Spanish.</li> <li>• Created a <b>SlideShare Channel for <i>Early On</i> Michigan</b> which hosts the past four years of <i>Early On</i> Public Awareness and Project Find Michigan presentations provided at conferences. SlideShare acts as a platform to host presentations and related documents in an engaged format.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Continue to work with the Michigan Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) on Assuring Better Child Health and Development (ABCD) grant to improve universal developmental screening at well child visits.</p>	<p>Ongoing through 2012</p>	<p>DCH – Medicaid Michigan Chapter of the AAP CSPD Contractor</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The ABCD Project promotes the use of an objective developmental screening tool as part of well-child care. The target population is infants and toddlers, age birth to three who are eligible for Medicaid. A pilot study was done in nine pediatric practices and data from the first six months looks promising for identifying children who are eligible for early intervention services.</p> <p>Continue collaboration with the ABCD initiative through the provision of resources and supports.</p> <p>In collaboration with the ABCD Project, a workgroup was developed and met several times throughout 2009 with the Michigan Chapter of the AAP and DCH to streamline the referral process for primary care providers.</p> <p>In FFY 2010, DCH received money from the Early Childhood Investment Corporation to continue to train physicians on using standardized developmental screening tools at well-child visits, and in how to make the appropriate community linkage for the child who is demonstrating concerns. They will continue to work with the Michigan Chapter of the AAP and Michigan Academy of Family Physicians to train physicians on tools such as the ASQ and ASQ SE and encourage social-emotional as well as developmental screening. The goal is to increase the number of children aged 0-3 years who are identified as potentially needing EI services, especially birth to one year olds, and should be referred for further evaluation.</p>		

# APR Template – Part C (4)

## Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

<b>Activity:</b> The percent of infants and toddlers served, age birth to three, targets were set for 2011 and 2012.	2010-2012	MDE MICC
<b>Discussion:</b> FFY 2010           Target- 2.7% FFY 2011           Target- 2.75% FFY 2012           Target- 2.8%		
<b>Justification:</b> The extension of the APR format and guidance from the MICC resulted in the new targets. After the review of data, the discussion resulted in setting more realistic targets. The MICC recommended setting a lower target to encourage local programs to continue current activities.		

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

See page 1 of this APR.

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

**Indicator 7:** Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:**  
Percent = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was 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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:**

100%
------

Data were collected in MEGS through a local self-assessment. Local early intervention programs selected a random representative sample of children. Local early intervention programs were required to sample 10% of their snapshot number or a minimum of ten records, whichever is greater. The records were a representative sample chosen from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011.

**Infants Evaluated and Assessed and Provided an Initial IFSP Meeting Within Part C's 45-day Timeline:**

a. Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	<b>629</b>
b. Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	<b>629</b>
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 (Percent = [(a) divided by (b)] times 100)	<b>100%</b>

## Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

All children referred to *Early On* are required to receive a comprehensive evaluation for eligibility and assessment of development and an initial IFSP meeting within 45 calendar days of referral. For this data collection activity, each local early intervention program was instructed to select a representative sample of 10%, or no less than ten children for small local early intervention programs, based on gender, ethnicity, eligibility (Part C or Part C and Michigan Special Education), and age. The data from the record review of the files from that sample were analyzed to compute the target data for FFY 2010. There were **100%** (629 of 629 of which there were 27 exceptional family circumstances) of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs who were first enrolled between July 1, 2010, and June 30, 2011, and had an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting within Part C's 45-day timeline.

The increase in performance rate in FFY 2010 as compared to FFY 2009 (99.50%) may be attributed to a number of factors. Michigan's CSPD grantee held several trainings to ensure that local early intervention programs understood the requirements of Indicator 7, in particular, how to document exceptional family circumstances.

During FFY 2010, Michigan continued updating the Michigan Part C data system to include the collection of data regarding exceptional family circumstances; details of Michigan's progress with the upgrades are provided in the discussion of the planned improvement activities in this indicator. In order to collect data for this indicator, the whole state submitted data in a local self-assessment using MEGS.

Michigan did meet the target of 100% compliance with this indicator. Through self assessment, details on exceptional family circumstances were recorded and included in the FFY 2010 calculation. Twenty-seven records had exceptional family circumstances documented in the file. They included requests from parents to wait on completing the multi-disciplinary evaluation and IFSP meeting, hospitalization of children, and parents not home.

One local early intervention program was issued a finding in FFY 2009 and had to submit, for approval, a corrective action plan in the CIMS-2 system that detailed strategies that the local early intervention program was to take to correct noncompliance, as soon as possible, but no later than one year from notification of the finding, including verification by the State. As part of the corrective action planning process, progress reports were submitted. Local early intervention programs are provided assistance by local regional monitors to develop corrective action plans and correct individual and systemic noncompliance. Progress reports required the local early intervention program to conduct file reviews. When progress reports indicated compliance or that a State target had been met, MDE required the early intervention program to submit files to the Lead Agency for verification of correction of noncompliance. A sample of records was sent to MDE, and MDE used a checklist to verify correction of noncompliance.

MDE requested that the local early intervention program identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever was greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the Federal and State standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. Verification involves review of a sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1).

Local early intervention programs are notified of the outcome of verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter. The collection of exceptional family circumstances helps compliance with this indicator. Another reason for the progress in this indicator is the training and technical assistance provided by the State and the training entity.

In order to maintain compliance, MDE will continue providing technical assistance through online trainings through MDE's CSPD grantee. In addition, MDE will monitor data to assure that local early intervention

## Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan  
State

programs that are found to be in noncompliance write and implement corrective action plans. The one local early intervention program that received a finding in FFY 2009 has been verified and closed.

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred in FFY 2010:

An update on the progress of each activity is included. Activities that were completed in FFY 2009 or earlier and have been explained in the FFY 2009 APR have been removed.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
<p><b>Activity:</b> The compliance portion of CIMS monitoring will address the 45-day timeline issue by collecting file review data from local early intervention programs.</p> <p>The data reported to MDE will be verified on a random basis. MDE will work with NCRRC to finalize the verification process in winter 2008.</p>	<p><b>Completed</b></p> <p>Winter 2007 and ongoing</p>	<p>CIMS contractor MDE staff</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The local self-assessment portion of CIMS began in the fall of 2007. One of the three cohorts, each of which consists of 19 of the 57 local early intervention programs, completed the Service Provider Self Review (SPSR). It included a child record review of 10%, or a minimum of ten files, which includes detailed questions regarding complete, multidisciplinary and timely evaluation and assessment, the initial IFSP meeting and the completed IFSP. The SPSR provided Michigan with additional data around evaluation, assessment and the 45-day timeline as well as allowing local early intervention programs an opportunity to evaluate their own systems and implement improvement activities in a proactive manner.</p> <p>The CIMS process, which began in April 2009, has each local early intervention program involved in data analysis. Each local early intervention program is required to analyze its data and if compliance is not met, complete activities. Activities include reviewing more recent data, participating in detailed technical assistance specific to the indicator where compliance has not been attained, and reviewing specific child records that the system instructs them to review. Verification will take place approximately eight months after the finding has been released and will require local early intervention programs to select specific records, as indicated by MDE, and send the records to MDE for verification. MDE uses a checklist, based upon Federal regulations, to verify compliance. When correction of noncompliance is verified, a formal letter is sent to the local early intervention program closing the finding.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Analyze data measuring this indicator and develop additional improvement activities.</p>	<p>Ongoing with annual review through 2012</p>	<p>Interagency staff Part C contractors MICC Stakeholders</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> As evidenced in the APR, analysis of data from multiple sources related to the SPP indicators helped Michigan identify issues within the field that need additional guidance or dialogue and plan opportunities related to the indicators and Michigan's system of general supervision in order to correct noncompliance.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Review fiscal costs and benefits of contracting regionalized nursing services to provide health information and complete vision and hearing checks.</p>	<p>Fall 2008-ongoing</p>	<p>MDE staff MICC Interagency staff Stakeholders</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> This would lower Michigan's reliance on health providers who do not consider themselves or their services a part of the Part C system, and improve the rate of receipt of health information for inclusion in the evaluation for eligibility.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> The CSPD contractor will develop an electronic system for tracking training and technical assistance provided to local early intervention programs by the contractor staff members or the State administrators.</p>	<p>Winter 2008</p>	<p>MDE staff Interagency staff CSPD contractor Grant manager</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The system will allow the CSPD contractor to provide information on training and technical assistance when requested, sorted by local early intervention program or topic. MDE will then be able to analyze these data for multiple purposes.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> MDE, State-level partners, and contractors will continue to improve communication with health professionals.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>MDE staff Interagency staff CSPD contractor</p>

## Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan  
State

<b>Discussion:</b> This is another strategy for increasing the availability of health information in a timely manner for inclusion in the evaluation of eligibility.		
<b>Activity:</b> Develop a frequently asked questions web page that can be accessed by local early intervention programs and updated as needed by MDE.	Summer 2008  Ongoing	MDE staff (ECE&FS and OSE) Interagency staff CSPD contractor Michigan Part C data system contractor Child and Family Outcomes contractor
<b>Discussion:</b> This will allow easy access to frequently asked questions to everyone in the <i>Early On</i> field and ensure that consistent answers are provided. Tracking the frequency of questions will also help the State to determine when a reference bulletin is necessary.		
<b>Activity:</b> Update Michigan's Part C data system to include dates for the initial IFSP meeting and completion date of the IFSP.	2009	MDE staff Michigan Part C data system
<b>Discussion:</b> In FFY 2009, Michigan added a field to its data system to accurately account for timely services. Training began in FFY 2009 and will continue. Beginning July 1, 2010, all local early intervention programs were required to enter these data into the data system. Michigan is in the process of ensuring that data entered into the data system are accurate and complete.		
<b>Activity:</b> Add component in the CIMS system to validate data entered into Michigan's Part C data system.	2010-2012	MDE staff CIMS contractor
<b>Discussion:</b> Beginning in FFY 2009, CIMS added a component to allow local early intervention programs to validate data. In FFY 2009, pilot sites were chosen to complete this activity. In FFY 2010, all local early intervention programs were required to complete validation activities through CIMS.		
<b>Activity:</b> Update Michigan's Part C data system to allow local early intervention systems to enter exceptional family circumstances.	2010-2012	MDE staff Michigan Part C data system
<b>Discussion:</b> Beginning in FFY 2009, one of the fields available in Michigan's data system was the reason for late services. Local early intervention programs were required to enter this field as of July 1, 2010.		
<b>Activity:</b> Update Michigan's Part C data system to allow local early intervention programs to generate reports to indicate when timelines need to be met.	2010-2012	MDE staff Michigan Part C data system
<b>Discussion:</b> The Michigan Part C data system allows local early intervention programs to generate reports for a variety of activities. Local early intervention programs can create lists for timelines. This will help local early intervention programs with compliance indicators.		
<b>Activity:</b> Train local early intervention programs to use all components of Michigan's Part C data system.	2010-ongoing	MDE staff Michigan Part C data system
<b>Discussion:</b> Training local early intervention programs on the new components of the Part C data system as well as CIMS will allow the programs to utilize the enhancements to ensure compliance.		

### Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2009 for this indicator: 99.50%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2009 (the period from July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010)	1
2. Number of FFY 2009 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	1
3. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

## Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan  
State

### Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

4. Number of FFY 2008 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	<b>0</b>
5. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	<b>0</b>
6. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	<b>0</b>

As reported in the FFY 2009 APR, all instances of noncompliance have been corrected.

#### Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

All local early intervention programs that received findings were required to submit corrective action plans using the CIMS-2 system. In addition, progress reporting was required for those local early intervention programs where verification of correction of noncompliance had not been submitted to MDE. When data from progress reports indicated correction of noncompliance had been met, MDE required early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency for verification of correction of noncompliance. The Lead Agency uses a checklist, based on Federal requirements, to verify correction of noncompliance.

MDE requested that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever was greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the Federal and State standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. Verification involves review of a new sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a).

Local early intervention programs are notified of the verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter closing the corrective action plan. In addition, the finding is closed out in the CIMS-2 system. For those local early intervention programs that did not meet their interim targets and compliance, sanctions will be enforced which may include being focused monitored, a compliance agreement, or intensive State supervision. Additional assistance to local programs was provided by local regional monitoring staff on how to correct for individual noncompliance and how to develop practices to assure ongoing compliance.

#### Verification of Correction of FFY 2008 noncompliance or FFY 2008 findings (either timely or subsequent):

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 7.

#### Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008:

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 7.

## Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan  
State

### Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):

All local early intervention programs that were issued findings in FFY 2007 have corrected noncompliance. Reporting on all local early intervention programs issued findings for Indicator 7, were reported as corrected in the FFY 2009 APR.

1. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP's June 2010 FFY 2008 APR response table for this indicator	<b>0</b>
2. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings the State has verified as corrected	<b>0</b>
3. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	<b>0</b>

### Verification of Remaining FFY 2007 findings:

All local early intervention programs that were issued findings in FFY 2007 have corrected noncompliance. Reporting on all local early intervention programs issued findings for Indicator 7, were reported as corrected in the FFY 2008 APR.

### Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007:

All local early intervention programs that were issued findings in FFY 2007 have corrected noncompliance. Reporting on all local early intervention programs issued findings for Indicator 7, were reported as corrected in the FFY 2008 APR.

### Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2006 or Earlier (if applicable):

All local early intervention programs that were issued findings in FFY 2007 have corrected noncompliance. Reporting on all local early intervention programs issued findings for Indicator 7, were reported as corrected in the FFY 2008 APR.

### Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the 45-day timeline requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>	<p>Michigan has verified correction of noncompliance for all local early intervention programs that were issued findings in FFY 2007. No findings were issued in FFY 2008, all noncompliance was continued noncompliance. One finding was issued in FFY 2009 and that finding has been verified and closed. The State reported the correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p> <p>The State has reviewed the improvement activities for this indicator.</p>

<p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a) (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 conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, for any child for whom the 45-day timeline was not met, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>	<p>MDE requested that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever was greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the Federal and State standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. Verification involves review of a new sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1).</p> <p>Local early intervention programs are notified of the outcome of verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter. The collection of exceptional family circumstances helps compliance with this indicator. Another reason for the progress in this indicator is the training and technical assistance provided by the State and the training entity.</p> <p>When conducting on-site monitoring, the State issues child Level Corrective Action Plans for all instances where the child has not received his/her 45-day timeline activities. The local early intervention program has 60 days to implement the activity/activities and send to the State evidence that the activity/activities took place. In addition, in the MEGS local self-assessment, the State asks that for any child where the 45-day timeline was not met, did the child receive the required activity/activities. In all instances, the children received their required 45-day timeline activities. Verification involves review of a new sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a).</p>
--	--

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010 (if applicable):**

No revisions at this time.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

See page 1 of this APR.

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

**Indicator 8a:** Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:

- A. IFSPs with transition steps and services; (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning, including the reasons for delay.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:**

100%
------

Data were collected in MEGS through a local self-assessment. Local early intervention programs were required to select a random representative sample of children. Local early intervention programs were required to sample 10% of their snapshot number or a minimum of ten records, whichever was greater. The records were a representative sample chosen from July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2011.

**Children Exiting Part C who Received Timely Transition Planning:**

a. Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	<b>636</b>
b. Number of children exiting Part C	<b>636</b>
Percentage of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday. (Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100)	<b>100%</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2010:**

During FFY 2010, Michigan was in the process of updating the Michigan Part C data system to include the collection of data regarding transitions; details of Michigan’s progress with the upgrades are provided in the discussion of the planned improvement activities in this indicator. In order to collect data for this

## Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

indicator, the State collected data through a local self-assessment in MEGS. For this data collection activity, each local early intervention program was instructed to select a representative sample of 10%, or no less than ten children, for small local early intervention programs, based on gender, ethnicity, eligibility (Part C or Part C and Michigan Special Education), and age.

The increase in performance from 99.33% in FFY 2009 to 100% in FFY 2010 may be attributed to many things. Michigan's CSPD grantee held several trainings around the State to ensure that local early intervention programs understood the requirements for transition planning as well as a transition conference, for those children potentially eligible for Part B services. In particular, training targeted how to document exceptional family circumstances and what must occur in the transition process. In addition, the State revised its requirement for identifying findings. The State also revised its requirements for response to findings from each local early intervention program. Based on this new approach, each local early intervention program was required to submit, for approval, an improvement plan that detailed strategies that the local early intervention program was required to accomplish in order to correct noncompliance, as soon as possible, but no later than one year from notification of the finding, including verification by the State.

Michigan met the target of 100% compliance with this indicator. Through local self-assessment, details on exceptional family circumstances were recorded and included in the FFY 2010 calculation. Fourteen children had exceptional family circumstances documented in the file. They included requests from parents to wait on transition planning, hospitalization of children, and parents not home.

Three local early intervention programs were issued findings in FFY 2009 and had to submit, for approval, corrective action plans in the CIMS-2 system that detailed strategies that the local early intervention program would take to correct noncompliance, as soon as possible, but no later than one year from notification of the finding, including verification by the State. As part of the corrective action planning process, progress reports were submitted. Local early intervention programs were provided assistance by local regional monitors to develop corrective action plans and correct individual and systemic noncompliance. Progress reports required the local early intervention program to conduct file reviews. As part of the corrective action planning process, local early intervention programs are required to conduct file reviews as part of the quarterly reporting process. When data from progress reports indicate correction of noncompliance has been met, MDE requires early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency for verification of correction of noncompliance. This requires the local early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency which uses a checklist to verify correction of noncompliance. The checklist is based upon Federal guidelines.

MDE requested that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever was greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the Federal and State standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. Verification involves review of a new sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(4), 303.344(h), and 303.148(b)(2)(i).

Local early intervention programs are notified of the verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter closing the corrective action plan. The three local early intervention programs that received findings in FFY 2009 were closed and verified within one year of the notification of the finding.

As part of the corrective action planning process, local early intervention programs are required to conduct file reviews as part of the quarterly reporting process. Local early intervention programs were provided assistance by local regional monitors to develop corrective action plans and correct individual and systemic noncompliance. When data from progress reports indicate correction of noncompliance has

## Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan  
State

been met, MDE requires early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency for verification of correction of noncompliance. This requires the local early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency which uses a checklist to verify correction of noncompliance. The checklist is based upon Federal guidelines. Local early intervention programs are notified of the verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter closing the corrective action plan.

### Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2009 for this indicator: 99.33%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2008 (the period from July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010)	<b>3</b>
2. Number of FFY 2009 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	<b>3</b>
3. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	<b>0</b>

### Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

4. Number of FFY 2009 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	<b>0</b>
5. Number of FFY 2009 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	<b>0</b>
6. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	<b>0</b>

### Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

All local early intervention programs that received findings were required to submit corrective action plans using the CIMS-2 system. In addition, progress reporting was required for those local early intervention programs where verification of correction of noncompliance had not been submitted to MDE. When data from progress reports indicated correction of noncompliance had been met, MDE required early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency for verification of correction of noncompliance. This required the local early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency that uses a checklist, based on Federal requirements, to verify correction of noncompliance.

MDE requested that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever was greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the Federal and State standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. Verification involves review of a new sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a).

Local early intervention programs are notified of the verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter closing the corrective action plan. In addition, the finding is closed out in the CIMS-2 system. For those local early intervention programs that did not meet their interim targets and compliance,

## Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

sanctions are enforced which may include being focused monitored, a compliance agreement, or intensive State supervision. Additional assistance to local programs was provided by local regional monitoring staff on how to correct for individual noncompliance and how to develop practices to assure ongoing compliance.

### **Verification of Correction of FFY 2009 noncompliance or FFY 2009 findings (either timely or subsequent):**

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8a.

### **Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009:**

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8a.

### **Correction of Remaining FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):**

1. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP's June 2010 FFY 2008 APR response table for this indicator	0
2. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected	0
3. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

### **Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2008 findings:**

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8a.

### **Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008:**

Each local early intervention program that was issued a finding in FFY 2007 had to submit, for approval, a corrective action plan in the CIMS-2 system that detailed strategies the local early intervention program was to take to correct noncompliance, as soon as possible, but no later than one year from notification of the finding, including verification by the State. As part of the corrective action planning process, progress reports were submitted. Local early intervention programs were provided assistance by local regional monitors to develop corrective action plans and correct individual and systemic noncompliance. Progress reports required the local early intervention program to conduct file reviews. When progress reports indicated compliance or that a State target had been met, MDE required early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency for verification of correction of noncompliance. A sample of records was sent to MDE, and MDE used a checklist to verify correction of noncompliance.

MDE requested that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever was greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the Federal and State standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. Verification involves review of a sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1).

## Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan  
State

Local early intervention programs are notified of the outcome of verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter. The collection of exceptional family circumstances helps compliance with this indicator. Another reason for the progress in this indicator is the training and technical assistance provided by the State and the training entity.

### Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2007 or Earlier (if applicable):

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8a.

### Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the IFSP transition content requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4), 303.344(h) and 20 U.S.C.1436(a)(3). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>	<p>Michigan has verified correction of noncompliance for all local early intervention programs that were issued findings in FFY 2009 and earlier. The State reported the correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p> <p>The State has reviewed the improvement activities for this indicator.</p>
<p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) and 20 U.S.C. 1436(a)(3) (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 developed an IFSP with transition steps and services for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program (i.e., the child has exited the State's Part C program due to age or other reasons), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>	<p>MDE requests that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever is greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the Federal and State standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. Verification involves review of a sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1).</p> <p>Local early intervention programs are notified of the outcome of verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter. The collection of exceptional family circumstances helps compliance with this indicator. Another reason for the progress in this indicator is the training and technical assistance provided by the State and the training entity.</p> <p>When conducting on-site monitoring, the State issues Child Level Corrective Action Plans for all instances where the child has not received timely transition planning, including steps and services. The local early intervention</p>

# Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

	<p>program has 30 days to implement the activity/activities and send to the State evidence that the activity/activities took place. In addition, in the MEGS local self-assessment, the State asks that for all children where timely transition planning was not met, did the child receive the required activity/activities. In all instances, the children received the required transition plan, with steps and services.</p>
--	---

## Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2010:

An update on the progress of each activity is included. Activities that were completed in FFY 2009 or earlier and have been explained in the FFY 2009 APR have been removed.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
<p><b>Activity:</b> The Michigan Part C data system will be upgraded to ensure timely and accurate collection of utilization and outcome data for <i>Early On</i>.</p>	<p>2006-2008  Ongoing</p>	<p>Part C Administrative Structure Michigan Part C data system contractor</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> In addition to general Michigan Part C data system upgrades described under Indicator 1, updates to the data system will allow Michigan to include details of transition planning and the date of the transition conference. In addition, the system will collect data related to exceptional family circumstances. This will allow Michigan to notify service areas of findings in a more timely manner, report compliance data for all 57 service areas for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR to be submitted in February 2010, better analyze reasons for non-compliance, and provide additional data about the local early intervention programs.</p> <p>For the FFY 2007 APR, data for this indicator were collected through the Service Provider Self Review (SPSR). One cohort of 19 local early intervention programs completed and submitted the SPSR, including child record review results, in spring 2008. The other two cohorts completed and submitted self-assessments in spring 2008.</p> <p>The process of upgrading the Michigan Part C data system has been time and resource consuming at the State and local level. Adding fields to a web-based data collection system is approximately a three-year process. One year is required to program and pilot the changes. Another year is needed to train staff and provide technical assistance to get valid and reliable data. Finally, in the third year, data will be available for reporting.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> The <i>Early On</i> system will focus on strengthening partnerships between Part C and Part B personnel at the State, ISD, and LEA levels, and with community partners.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>MDE staff Head Start Local early intervention programs Michigan 4C's Other community partners</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> During FFY 2006, communication was increased with ISD Special Education Directors through the use of monthly conference calls with <i>Early On</i> being one of the standing agenda items. Additionally, Part C MDE staff members attended the annual ISD Special Education Monitors meeting to share Part C developments. Finally, the OSE contracted a Part C monitoring consultant to facilitate communication between Part B and Part C at the State level. In FFY 2007, Michigan <i>Early On</i> attended multiple ISD Special Education Director meetings and developed a stakeholder group including both local <i>Early On</i> Coordinators and ISD Special Education Directors to provide insight on the local ramifications of State policy and procedure changes.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> The <i>Early On</i> system will make available learning opportunities for families to partner in the transition process.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Families PTI Contractors MICC/PIC NECTAC</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The CSPD, PTI, and parent support contractors will work together to provide a Parent Institute in spring 2008 that will provide an overview of the Part C system including parent rights throughout the process. Due to a low response rate, the Parent Institute did not take place.</p> <p>All trainings that the CSPD contractor holds are available and open to parents if they wish to attend.</p>		

## Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan  
State

<b>Activity:</b> Analyze data measuring this indicator and develop additional improvement activities.	Ongoing with annual review through 2012	Interagency staff Part C contractors MICC Stakeholders
<b>Discussion:</b> As evidenced in the APR, analysis of data from multiple sources related to the SPP indicators helped Michigan identify issues within the field that need additional guidance or dialogue and plan opportunities related to the indicators and Michigan's system of general supervision in order to correct noncompliance.		
<b>Activity:</b> Update Michigan's Part C data system to include email notification to the LEA for local early intervention programs for children who are potentially eligible for Part B.	2009	MDE staff Michigan Part C data system
<b>Discussion:</b> In FFY 2009, Michigan added a field to its data system to accurately account for timely transition planning. Training began in FFY 2009 and will continue. Beginning July 1, 2010, all local early intervention programs were required to enter these data into the data system. The FFY 2010 APR used the Michigan data system to collect this information.		
<b>Activity:</b> Add component in the CIMS system to validate data entered into Michigan's Part C data system.	2010-2012	MDE staff CIMS contractor
<b>Discussion:</b> Beginning in FFY 2009, CIMS added a component to allow local early intervention programs to validate data. In FFY 2009, pilot sites were chosen to complete this activity. Beginning in FFY 2010, all local early intervention programs were required to complete validation activities through CIMS.		
<b>Activity:</b> Update Michigan's Part C data system to allow local early intervention systems to enter exceptional family circumstances.	2010-2012	MDE staff Michigan Part C data system
<b>Discussion:</b> Beginning in FFY 2009, Michigan's data system included a field to enter the reason for late services. Local early intervention programs were required to enter this field as of July 1, 2010.		
<b>Activity:</b> Update Michigan's Part C data system to allow local early intervention programs to generate reports to indicate when timelines need to be met.	2010-2012	MDE staff Michigan Part C data system
<b>Discussion:</b> The Michigan Part C data system allows local early intervention programs to generate reports for a variety of activities. Local early intervention programs can create lists for timelines. This will help local early intervention programs with compliance indicators.		
<b>Activity:</b> Train local early intervention programs to use all components of Michigan's Part C data system.	2010-ongoing	MDE staff Michigan Part C data system
<b>Discussion:</b> Training local early intervention programs on the new components of the Part C data system as well as CIMS will allow the programs to utilize the enhancements to ensure compliance.		

### Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011 (if applicable):

No revisions at this time.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

See page 1 of this APR.

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

**Indicator 8b:** Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:  
 B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and  
 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.  
 Account for untimely transition conferences, including reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:**

100%
------

Data were collected in MEGS through a local self-assessment. Local early intervention programs were required to select a random representative sample of children. Local early intervention programs were required to sample 10% of their snapshot number or a minimum of ten records, whichever was greater. The records were a representative sample chosen from July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2011.

**Children Exiting Part C who Received Timely Transition Planning (Notification to LEA):**

a. Number of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the notification to the LEA occurred	<b>381</b>
b. Number of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	<b>381</b>
Percentage of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday (Notification to LEA) (Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100)	<b>100%</b>

Given that Michigan is a birth mandate state and the Part C local lead agency is the ISD, notification from Part C is internal and takes place as the child is identified as potentially Michigan Special Education eligible at any time from birth to age three years. Any child found eligible for Michigan Special Education is automatically transitioned into Part B Special Education by age three. “The school district of residence is responsible for conducting the initial individualized education program team meeting involving a student in its district and shall conduct, or authorize the operating district to conduct, each subsequent

## Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan  
State

individualized education program team meeting at a mutually agreed upon time and place.” Michigan Special Education Rule R 340.1721c. Therefore, LEAs are notified of **100%** of children potentially eligible for Part B.

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2010:

During FFY 2010, Michigan was in the process of updating the Michigan Part C data system to include the collection of data regarding transitions; details of Michigan’s progress with the upgrades are provided in the discussion of the planned improvement activities in this indicator. In order to collect data for this indicator, the State collected data through a local self-assessment in MEGS. For this data collection activity, each local early intervention program was instructed to select a representative sample of 10%, or no less than ten children for small local early intervention programs, based on gender, ethnicity, eligibility (Part C or Part C and Michigan Special Education), and age.

The maintenance of compliance in Indicator 8b in FFY 2010 may be attributed to a number of factors. Michigan’s CSPD grantee held several trainings around the state to ensure that local early intervention programs understood the requirements for transition planning as well as a transition conference, for those children potentially eligible for Part B services. In particular, training targeted how to document exceptional family circumstances and what must occur in the transition process. In addition, the State revised its requirement for identifying findings. The State also revised its requirements for response to findings from each local early intervention program. Based on this new approach, each local early intervention program was required to submit for approval, a corrective action plan that detailed strategies that the local early intervention program was required to accomplish in order to correct noncompliance, as soon as possible, but no later than one year from notification of the finding, including verification by the State.

### Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2009 for this indicator: 100%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2008 (the period from July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010)	<b>0</b>
2. Number of FFY 2009 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	<b>0</b>
3. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	<b>0</b>

### Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

4. Number of FFY 2009 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	<b>0</b>
5. Number of FFY 2009 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	<b>0</b>
6. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	<b>0</b>

### Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8b.

## Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

### Verification of Correction of FFY 2009 noncompliance or FFY 2009 findings (either timely or subsequent):

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8b.

### Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009:

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8b.

### Correction of Remaining FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8b.

1. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP's June 2011 FFY 2009 APR response table for this indicator	<b>0</b>
2. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected	<b>0</b>
3. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	<b>0</b>

### Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2008 findings:

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8b.

### Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008:

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8b.

### Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2007 or Earlier (if applicable):

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8b.

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2010:

An update on the progress of each activity is included. Activities that were completed in FFY 2009 or earlier and have been explained in the FFY 2009 APR have been removed.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
<b>Activity:</b> The Michigan Part C data system will be upgraded to ensure timely and accurate collection of utilization and outcome data for <i>Early On</i> .	2006 - 2008  Ongoing	Part C Administrative Structure Michigan Part C data system contractor
<b>Discussion:</b> In addition to general Michigan Part C data system upgrades described under Indicator 1, updates to the data system will allow Michigan to include details of transition planning and the date of the transition conference. In addition, the system will collect data related to exceptional family circumstances. This will allow Michigan to notify service areas of findings in a more timely manner, report compliance data for all 57 service areas for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR to be submitted in February 2010, better analyze reasons for non-compliance, and provide additional data about the local early intervention programs. For the FFY 2007 APR, data for this indicator were collected through the Service Provider Self Review (SPSR). One cohort of 19 local early intervention programs completed and submitted the SPSR, including child record review results, in spring 2008. The other two cohorts completed and submitted self assessments in spring 2008.		

## Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan  
State

<p>The process of upgrading the Michigan Part C data system has been time and resource consuming at the State and local level. Adding fields to a web-based data collection system is approximately a three-year process. One year is required to program and pilot the changes. Another year is needed to train staff and provide technical assistance to get valid and reliable data. Finally, in the third year, data will be available for reporting.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> The <i>Early On</i> system will focus on strengthening partnerships between Part C and Part B personnel at the State, ISD, and LEA levels and with community partners.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>MDE staff Head Start Local early intervention programs Michigan 4C's Other community partners</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> During FFY 2006, communication was increased with ISD Special Education Directors through the use of monthly conference calls with <i>Early On</i> being one of the standing agenda items. Additionally, Part C MDE staff members attended the annual ISD Special Education Monitors meeting to share Part C developments. Finally, the Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services contracted a Part C monitoring consultant to facilitate communication between Part B and Part C at the State level. In FFY 2007, Michigan <i>Early On</i> attended multiple ISD Special Education Director meetings and developed a stakeholder group including both local <i>Early On</i> coordinators and ISD Special Education Directors to provide insight on the local ramifications of State policy and procedure changes.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> The <i>Early On</i> system will make available learning opportunities for families to partner in the transition process.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Families PTI Contractors MICC/PIC NECTAC</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The CSPD, PTI, and parent support contractors will work together to provide a Parent Institute in the spring of 2008 that will provide an overview of the Part C system including parent rights throughout the process. Due to a low response rate, the Parent Institute did not take place.</p> <p>All trainings that the CSPD contractor holds are available and open to parents if they wish to attend.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Analyze data measuring this indicator and develop additional improvement activities.</p>	<p>Ongoing with annual review through 2012</p>	<p>Interagency staff Part C contractors MICC Stakeholders</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> As evidenced in the APR, analysis of data from multiple sources related to the SPP indicators helped Michigan identify issues within the field that need additional guidance or dialogue and plan opportunities related to the indicators and Michigan's system of general supervision in order to correct noncompliance.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Update Michigan's Part C data system to include email notification to the LEA for local early intervention programs for children who are potentially eligible for Part B.</p>	<p>2009</p>	<p>MDE staff Michigan Part C data system</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> In FFY 2009, Michigan added a field to its data system to accurately account for timely transition planning. Training began in FFY 2009 and will continue. Beginning July 1, 2010, all local early intervention programs were required to enter these data into the data system. The FFY 2010 APR used the Michigan data system to collect this information.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Add component in the CIMS system to validate data entered into Michigan's Part C data system.</p>	<p>2010-2012</p>	<p>MDE staff CIMS contractor</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Beginning in FFY 2009, CIMS added a component to allow local early intervention programs to validate data. In FFY 2009, pilot sites were chosen to complete this activity. Beginning in FFY 2010, all local early intervention programs were required to complete validation activities through CIMS.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Update Michigan's Part C data system to allow local early intervention systems to enter exceptional family circumstances.</p>	<p>2010-2012</p>	<p>MDE staff Michigan Part C data system</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Beginning in FFY 2009, Michigan's data system included a field to enter the reason for late services. Local early intervention programs were required to enter this field as of July 1, 2010.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Update Michigan's Part C data system to allow local early intervention programs to generate reports to indicate when timelines need to be met.</p>	<p>2010-2012</p>	<p>MDE staff Michigan Part C data system</p>

## Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan  
State

<b>Discussion:</b> The Michigan Part C data system allows local early intervention programs to generate reports for a variety of activities. Local early intervention programs can create lists for timelines. This will help local early intervention programs with compliance indicators.		
<b>Activity:</b> Train local early intervention programs to use all components of Michigan's Part C data system.	2010-ongoing	MDE staff Michigan Part C data system
<b>Discussion:</b> Training local early intervention programs on the new components of the Part C data system as well as CIMS will allow the programs to utilize the enhancements to ensure compliance.		

### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011 (if applicable):**

No revisions at this time.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

See page 1 of this APR.

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

**Indicator 8c:** The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning, including the reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:**

99.48%
--------

Data were collected in MEGS through a local self-assessment. Local early intervention programs were required to select a random representative sample of children. Local early intervention programs were required to sample 10% of their snapshot number or a minimum of ten records, whichever was greater. The records were a representative sample chosen from July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2011.

**Children Exiting Part C who Received Timely Transition Planning (Transition Conference):**

a. Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred	<b>379</b>
b. Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	<b>381</b>
Percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has: C) Conducted the transition conference. (Percent = [(a) divided by (b)] times 100)	<b>99.48%</b>

### **Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2010:**

During FFY 2010, Michigan was in the process of updating the Michigan Part C data system to include the collection of data regarding transitions; details of Michigan's progress with the upgrades are provided in the discussion of the planned improvement activities in this indicator. In order to collect data for this indicator, the State collected data through a local self-assessment in MEGS. For this data collection activity, each local early intervention program was instructed to select a representative sample of 10%, or no less than ten children for small local early intervention programs, based on gender, ethnicity, eligibility (Part C or Part C and Michigan Special Education), and age.

The increase in performance rate in Indicator 8c in FFY 2010 (99.48%) as compared to FFY 2009 (99.26%) may be attributed to Michigan's emphasis on training new staff members.

Michigan's CSPD grantee held several trainings around the state to ensure that local early intervention programs understood the requirements for transition planning as well as a transition conference, for those children potentially eligible for Part B services. In particular, training targeted how to document exceptional family circumstances and what must occur in the transition process. In addition, the State revised its requirement for identifying findings. The State also revised its requirements for response to findings from each local early intervention program. Based on this new approach, each local early intervention program was required to submit for approval, an improvement plan that detailed strategies that the local early intervention program was required to accomplish in order to correct noncompliance, as soon as possible, but no later than one year from notification of the finding, including verification by the State.

Michigan did not meet the target of 100% compliance with this indicator. Through self-assessment, details on exceptional family circumstances were recorded and included in the FFY 2010 calculation. Eight children had exceptional family circumstances documented in the file. They included requests from parents to wait on transition conference, hospitalization of children, and parents not home. The two children who did not have timely transition conferences initiated, and did not have an exceptional family circumstance, received transition conferences indicated on their IFSP. As part of the local self-assessment in MEGS, early intervention programs were asked to document the cause for the delay. Staff unavailable or sick was the reason in all instances for a delay in timely transition conferences. In addition, as part of the local self-assessment in MEGS, early intervention programs were required to indicate whether the child received a timely transition conference; in all cases the child did receive the transition conference indicated on their IFSP.

Two local early intervention programs were issued findings in FFY 2009 and had to submit, for approval, corrective action plans in the CIMS-2 system that detailed strategies that the local early intervention program would take to correct noncompliance, as soon as possible, but no later than one year from notification of the finding, including verification by the State. As part of the corrective action planning process, progress reports were submitted. Local early intervention programs were provided assistance by local regional monitors to develop corrective action plans and correct individual and systemic noncompliance. Progress reports required the local early intervention program to conduct file reviews.

As part of the corrective action planning process, local early intervention programs are required to conduct file reviews as part of the quarterly reporting process. When data from progress reports indicate correction of noncompliance has been met, MDE requires early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency for verification of correction of noncompliance. This requires the local early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency which uses a checklist to verify correction of noncompliance. The checklist is based upon Federal guidelines.

MDE requested that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever was greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the Federal and State standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific

## Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan  
State

regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. Verification involves review of a sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(4), 303.344(h), and 303.148(b)(2)(i). The two local early intervention programs that received findings in FFY 2009 were verified and closed within one year of notification of noncompliance.

Local early intervention programs are notified of the verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter closing the corrective action plan.

As part of the corrective action planning process, local early intervention programs are required to conduct file reviews as part of the quarterly reporting process. Local early intervention programs were provided assistance by local regional monitors to develop corrective action plans and correct individual and systemic noncompliance. When data from progress reports indicate correction of noncompliance has been met, MDE requires early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency for verification of correction of noncompliance. This requires the local early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency which uses a checklist to verify correction of noncompliance. The checklist is based upon Federal guidelines. Local early intervention programs are notified of the verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter closing the corrective action plan.

In FFY 2010, one local early intervention program was issued a finding. This local had a focused monitoring visit in August 2011 and submitted a corrective action plan for review.

### Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2009 for this indicator: 99.26%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2008 (the period from July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009)	<b>2</b>
2. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	<b>2</b>
3. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	<b>0</b>

### FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

4. Number of FFY 2009 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	<b>0</b>
5. Number of FFY 2009 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	<b>0</b>
6. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	<b>0</b>

### Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

All local early intervention programs that received findings were required to submit corrective action plans using the CIMS-2 system. In addition, progress reporting was required for those local early intervention programs where verification of correction of noncompliance had not been submitted to MDE. When data

## Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

from progress reports indicated correction of noncompliance had been met, MDE required early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency for verification of correction of noncompliance. This required the local early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency that uses a checklist, based on Federal requirements, to verify correction of noncompliance.

MDE requested that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever was greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the Federal and State standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. Verification involves review of a sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a).

Local early intervention programs are notified of the verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter closing the corrective action plan. In addition, the finding is closed out in the CIMS-2 system. For those local early intervention programs that did not meet their interim targets and compliance, sanctions will be enforced which may include being focused monitored, a compliance agreement, or intensive State supervision. Additional assistance to local programs was provided by local regional monitoring staff on how to correct for individual noncompliance and how to develop practices to assure ongoing compliance.

### **Verification of Correction of FFY 2009 noncompliance or FFY 2009 findings (either timely or subsequent):**

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8c.

### **Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009:**

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8c.

### **Correction of Remaining FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):**

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8c.

1. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP's June 2011 FFY 2009 APR response table for this indicator	0
2. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected	0
3. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

### **Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2008 findings:**

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8c.

## Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan  
State

### Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008:

Each local early intervention program that was issued a finding in FFY 2007 had to submit, for approval, a corrective action plan in the CIMS-2 system that detailed strategies the local early intervention program was to take to correct noncompliance, as soon as possible, but no later than one year from notification of the finding, including verification by the State. As part of the corrective action planning process, progress reports were submitted. Local early intervention programs were provided assistance by local regional monitors to develop corrective action plans and correct individual and systemic noncompliance. Progress reports required the local early intervention program to conduct file reviews. When progress reports indicated compliance or that a State target had been met, MDE required early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency for verification of correction of noncompliance. A sample of records was sent to MDE, and MDE used a checklist to verify correction of noncompliance.

MDE requested that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever was greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the Federal and State standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. Verification involves review of a sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1).

Local early intervention programs are notified of the outcome of verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter. The collection of exceptional family circumstances helps compliance with this indicator. Another reason for the progress in this indicator is the training and technical assistance provided by the State and the training entity.

### Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2007 or Earlier (if applicable):

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8c.

### Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely transition conference requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>	<p>Michigan has verified correction of noncompliance for all local early intervention programs that were issued findings in FFY 2009 and earlier. The State reported the correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p> <p>The State has reviewed the improvement activities for this indicator.</p>

<p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)) (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 conducted a transition conference, although late, for any child potentially eligible for Part B whose transition conference was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>	<p>MDE requests that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever is greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the Federal and State standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. Verification involves review of a sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1).</p> <p>Local early intervention programs are notified of the outcome of verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter. The collection of exceptional family circumstances helps compliance with this indicator. Another reason for the progress in this indicator is the training and technical assistance provided by the State and the training entity.</p> <p>When conducting on-site monitoring, the State issues Child Level Corrective Action Plans for all instances where the child has not received timely transition planning, including steps and services. The local early intervention program has 30 days to implement the activity/activities and send to the State evidence that the activity/activities took place. In addition, in the MEGS local self-assessment, the State asks that for all children where timely transition planning was not met, did the child receive the required activity/activities. In all instances, the children received the required transition conference, with steps and services.</p>
---	---

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2010:**

An update on the progress of each activity is included. Activities that were completed in FFY 2009 or earlier and have been explained in the FFY 2009 APR have been removed.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
<p><b>Activity:</b> The Michigan Part C data system will be upgraded to ensure timely and accurate collection of utilization and outcome data for <i>Early On</i>.</p>	<p>2006-2008 Ongoing</p>	<p>Part C Administrative Structure Michigan Part C data system contractor</p>

# Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

<p><b>Discussion:</b> In addition to general Michigan Part C data system upgrades described under Indicator 1, updates to the data system will allow Michigan to include details of transition planning and the date of the transition conference. In addition, the system will collect data related to exceptional family circumstances. This will allow Michigan to notify service areas of findings in a more timely manner, report compliance data for all 57 service areas for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR to be submitted in February 2010, better analyze reasons for non-compliance, and provide additional data about the local early intervention programs.</p> <p>For the FFY 2007 APR, data for this indicator were collected through the Service Provider Self Review (SPSR). One cohort of 19 local early intervention programs completed and submitted the SPSR, including child record review results, in spring 2008. The other two cohorts completed and submitted self-assessments in spring 2008.</p> <p>The process of upgrading the Michigan Part C data system has been time and resource consuming at the State and local levels. Adding fields to a web-based data collection system is approximately a three-year process. One year is required to program and pilot the changes. Another year is needed to train staff and provide technical assistance to get valid and reliable data. Finally, in the third year, data will be available for reporting.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> The <i>Early On</i> system will focus on strengthening partnerships between Part C and Part B personnel at the State, ISD, and LEA levels and with community partners.</p>	Ongoing	MDE staff Head Start Local early intervention programs Michigan 4C's Other community partners
<p><b>Discussion:</b> During FFY 2006, communication was increased with ISD Special Education Directors through the use of monthly conference calls with <i>Early On</i> being one of the standing agenda items. Additionally, Part C MDE staff members attended the annual ISD Special Education Monitors meeting to share Part C developments. Finally, the Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services contracted a Part C monitoring consultant to facilitate communication between Part B and Part C at the State level. In FFY 2007, Michigan <i>Early On</i> attended multiple ISD Special Education Director meetings and developed a stakeholder group including both local <i>Early On</i> Coordinators and ISD Special Education Directors to provide insight on the local ramifications of State policy and procedure changes.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> The <i>Early On</i> system will make available learning opportunities for families to partner in the transition process.</p>	Ongoing	Families PTI Contractors MICC/PIC NECTAC
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The CSPD, PTI, and parent support contractors planned to work together to provide a Parent Institute in spring 2008 that would provide an overview of the Part C system including parent rights throughout the process. Due to a low response rate, the Parent Institute did not take place.</p> <p>All trainings that the CSPD contractor holds are available and open to parents if they wish to attend.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Award training and technical assistance, and child find and public awareness contracts.</p>	Completed October 2007	MDE staff
<p><b>Activity:</b> Analyze data measuring this indicator and develop additional improvement activities.</p>	Ongoing with annual review through 2012	Interagency staff Part C contractors MICC Stakeholders
<p><b>Discussion:</b> As evidenced in the APR, analysis of data from multiple sources related to the SPP indicators helped Michigan identify issues within the field that need additional guidance or dialogue and plan opportunities related to the indicators and Michigan's system of general supervision in order to correct noncompliance.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Update Michigan's Part C data system to include email notification to the LEA for local early intervention programs for children who are potentially eligible for Part B.</p>	2009	MDE staff Michigan Part C data system
<p><b>Discussion:</b> In FFY 2009, Michigan added a field to its data system to accurately account for timely transition planning. Training began in FFY 2009 and will continue. Beginning July 1, 2010, all local early intervention programs were required to enter these data into the data system.</p>		
<p><b>Activity:</b> Add component in the CIMS system to validate data entered into Michigan's Part C data system.</p>	2010-2012	MDE staff CIMS contractor

## Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan  
State

<b>Discussion:</b> Beginning in FFY 2009, CIMS added a component to allow local early intervention programs to validate data. In FFY 2009, pilot sites were chosen to complete this activity. Beginning in FFY 2010, all local early intervention programs were required to complete validation activities through CIMS.		
<b>Activity:</b> Update Michigan's Part C data system to allow local early intervention systems to enter exceptional family circumstances.	2010-2012	MDE staff Michigan Part C data system
<b>Discussion:</b> Beginning in FFY 2009, Michigan's data system included a field to enter the reason for late services. Local early intervention programs were required to enter this field as of July 1, 2010.		
<b>Activity:</b> Update Michigan's Part C data system to allow local early intervention programs to generate reports to indicate when timelines need to be met.	2010-2012	MDE staff Michigan Part C data system
<b>Discussion:</b> The Michigan Part C data system allows local early intervention programs to generate reports for a variety of activities. Local early intervention programs can create lists for timelines. This will help local early intervention programs with compliance indicators.		
<b>Activity:</b> Train local early intervention programs to use all components of Michigan's Part C data system.	2010-ongoing	MDE staff Michigan Part C data system
<b>Discussion:</b> Training local early intervention programs on the new components of the Part C data system as well as CIMS will allow the programs to utilize the enhancements to ensure compliance.		

### Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011 (if applicable):

No revisions at this time.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See page 1 of this APR.

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

**Indicator 9:** General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.  
(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:**

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

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

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

States are required to use the “Indicator C 9 Worksheet” to report data for this indicator.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:**

100%
------

INDICATOR C-9 WORKSHEET

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 through 6/30/10)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 through 6/30/10)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	5	5	5
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other			

# Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan  
State

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 through 6/30/10)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 through 6/30/10)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
home or community-based settings	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved outcomes	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other			
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other			
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other			
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	1	1	1
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	3	3	3
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			

# Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 through 6/30/10)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 through 6/30/10)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other			
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	2	2	2
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE:	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other			
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE:	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other			
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE:	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other			
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
<b>Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b</b>			11	11
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100.			(b) / (a) X 100 =	100.00%

### **Describe the process for selecting EIS programs for Monitoring:**

Eleven findings were made in FFY 2009. No findings of noncompliance were made in FFY 2008. All findings made in FFY 2007 have been verified as corrected and have been reported in the FFY 2008 APR.

Local early intervention programs are selected for focused monitoring based upon their percent of compliance in each of the compliance indicators. Those local early intervention programs that are not substantially compliant in one or more compliance indicators are potential candidates for focused monitoring.

### **Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2010:**

Data were gathered through local self-assessments and the Michigan Part C data system. Michigan did not have any findings through the dispute resolution process in FFY 2009.

The 100% correction of noncompliance rate may be attributed to the State's approach to identifying findings and steps that each local early intervention program was required to complete. Each local early intervention program was required to submit, for approval, an improvement plan that detailed strategies that the local early intervention program would take to correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from notification of the finding, including verification by the State. As part of the improvement planning process, quarterly reports were submitted. Quarterly reports required the local early intervention program to conduct file reviews. When quarterly reports indicated compliance or that a State target had been met, MDE required early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency for verification of correction of noncompliance. A sample of records was sent to MDE, and MDE used a checklist, based on Federal regulation, to verify correction of noncompliance. Local early intervention programs are notified of the outcome of verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter.

As Michigan continues to refine its new system of general supervision, the process of identifying and notifying local early intervention programs of noncompliance and then verifying correction within one year is becoming more effective and efficient. Michigan has developed a corrective action planning system, through CIMS, which mandates that local early intervention programs develop corrective action plans for correcting noncompliance. In addition, checklists have been developed to ensure that correction of noncompliance is verified. Local early intervention programs are required to submit actual Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs) and the State verifies compliance using the checklist. A formal letter is sent to the local early intervention program verifying correction of noncompliance.

Details regarding program-specific activities related to uncorrected noncompliance are provided in the corresponding APR indicators. Michigan's current system of integrated monitoring is composed of three components: Focused Monitoring, Data Analysis, and Verification. Sites are chosen for focused monitoring based upon data and how the local early intervention program performed on compliance indicators as well as performance/results indicators. In addition, the State takes into account timely correction of noncompliance, timely data submission, and accuracy of data submission. Sites are notified that they will be focused monitored by a formal letter stating which components are out of compliance. MDE staff visit each focused monitoring site for approximately three days. While there, MDE staff review records as well as meet with and ask questions of the staff and directors of the ISD. At the end of the focused monitoring visit, a preliminary report is delivered to the ISD. MDE staff write a formal report stating, when appropriate, that a corrective action plan must be completed and that correction of noncompliance must occur as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the date of notification of noncompliance, including verification. Approximately eight months after the focused monitoring visit, a focused monitoring follow-up visit occurs. At the focused monitoring follow-up visit, another record review is completed to verify correction of noncompliance. A formal letter is then sent to the ISD with the results of that follow-up visit.

## Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

The second component of the integrated monitoring system is data analysis. Local early intervention programs began data analysis in April 2009. Each local early intervention program receives a strand report for each compliance and results indicator. The strand report shows each local early intervention program whether it is in compliance or has reached the State target for each of the following indicators: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, and 8. When a local early intervention program is not in compliance, the CIMS-2 system will issue findings and directs the local early intervention program to specific activities that must occur. A corrective action plan for compliance indicators must be developed. Interim reports are analyzed by MDE. At the end of eight months, the State's web-based data system instructs the local intervention program to analyze randomly selected files for verification of correction of noncompliance. Local early intervention programs then mail copies of those files to MDE/Lead Agency so that staff can conduct verification utilizing a checklist. A formal letter is then sent to the local early intervention program stating the results of the verification. With results indicators, if a local early intervention program has not reached the State target, a monitoring activities report is generated. The monitoring activities report directs the local early intervention program to activities that must be completed.

The last component of the integrated monitoring system is verification. Verification takes place at any time. The State may choose local early intervention programs to verify data submission. A checklist was created and is used when actual files are sent to MDE for data verification.

**Note: For this indicator, report data on the correction of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2009 (July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010) and verified as corrected as soon as possible and in no case later than one year from identification.**

### Timely Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2009 (the period from July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010) (Sum of Column a on the Indicator C 9 Worksheet)	<b>11</b>
2. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS programs of the finding) (Sum of Column b on the Indicator C 9 Worksheet)	<b>11</b>
3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	<b>0</b>

### Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

4. Number of FFY 2009 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	<b>0</b>
5. Number of FFY 2009 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	<b>0</b>
6. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	<b>0</b>

### Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected

Local early intervention programs that have not verified correction of noncompliance will have sanctions enforced, which may include being focused monitored, a compliance agreement, or intensive State supervision.

**Verification of Correction of FFY 2009 Findings (either timely or subsequent)**

As part of the corrective action planning process, local early intervention programs are required to conduct file reviews as part of the quarterly reporting process. When data from progress reports indicate correction of noncompliance has been met, MDE requires early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency for verification of correction of noncompliance. This requires the local early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency which uses a checklist to verify correction of noncompliance. The checklist is based upon Federal guidelines.

MDE requested that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever is greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the Federal and State standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family.

Local early intervention programs are notified of the verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter closing the corrective action plan.

**Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction in FFY 2010 of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009:**

MDE requested that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever is greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the Federal and State standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family.

Local early intervention programs are notified of the verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter closing the corrective action plan.

**Correction of Remaining FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable)**

No findings were made in FFY 2008. All findings that were made in FFY 2007 were verified as corrected and reported in the FFY 2008 APR.

If the State reported less than 100% for this indicator in its FFY 2008 APR and did not report that the remaining FFY 2007 findings were subsequently corrected, provide the information below:

1. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings noted in OSEP's June 2011 FFY 2009 APR response table for this indicator	0
2. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected	0
3. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

# Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

## Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2007 or Earlier (if applicable)

All findings from 2009 and earlier have been verified and closed.

### Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to correct FFY 2008 noncompliance and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 in accordance with IDEA section 635(a)(10)(A), 34 CFR §303.501, and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>	<p>Michigan has verified correction of noncompliance for all local early intervention programs that were issued findings in FFY 2007. No findings were issued in FFY 2008, all noncompliance was continued noncompliance. The State reported the correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2008 APR. All findings issued in FFY 2009 have been verified and closed and reported in the FFY 2010 APR.</p>
<p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report that it verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (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, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>	<p>MDE requests that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever is greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the Federal and State standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. Verification involves review of a sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1).</p> <p>Local early intervention programs are notified of the outcome of verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter. The collection of exceptional family circumstances helps compliance with this indicator. Another reason for the progress in this indicator is the training and technical assistance provided by the State and the training entity.</p> <p>When conducting on-site monitoring, the State issues Child Level Corrective Action Plans for all instances where the child has not received the required components. The local early intervention program has 30 days to implement the activity/activities and send to the State evidence that the activity/activities took place. In addition, in the MEGS local self-assessment the State asks for all children where the required components have not taken place, did the child receive the required activity/activities.</p>

## Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan  
State

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2010:

An update on the progress of each activity is included. Activities that were completed in FFY 2009 or earlier and have been explained in the FFY 2009 APR have been removed.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
<b>Activity:</b> The <i>Early On</i> system will monitor progress on all five Family Outcomes from the ECO Center.	Fall 2009	To be determined based on tool selected for measurement.
<b>Activity:</b> Analyze data measuring this indicator and develop additional improvement activities.	Ongoing with annual review through 2012.	Interagency staff Part C contractors MICC Stakeholders
<b>Discussion:</b> As evidenced in the APR, analysis of data from multiple sources related to the SPP indicators helped Michigan identify issues within the field that need additional guidance or dialogue and plan opportunities related to the indicators and Michigan's system of general supervision in order to correct noncompliance.		
<b>Activity:</b> Implement the third component of Michigan's system of general supervision, verification, related to focused monitoring, record review, and data review findings.	Ongoing	CIMS contractor MDE staff (ECE&FS and OSE)
<b>Discussion:</b> As Michigan's understanding of the requirements for general supervision continues to expand, MDE staff members, working with the CIMS contractor, have been able to develop a process for verifying the correction of findings of noncompliance. Because of the higher need of those local early intervention programs selected for focused monitoring, verification of those sites will be completed by an on-site visit which will consist of a record review of files and an interview with key personnel. Verification of correction of noncompliance for local early intervention programs that were not focused monitored occurs when a local early intervention program reports correction of noncompliance on a corrective action plan. The State sends out a letter asking for a sample of actual records to be sent to the State. The State then reviews the records, based on a checklist and verifies correction of noncompliance. Once verification takes place, a letter is sent to the local early intervention program either stating they corrected noncompliance or that there has not been correction of noncompliance.		
<b>Activity:</b> Complete the development of and streamline the entire general supervision system for <i>Early On</i> .	Spring 2008  Ongoing	NCRRC MDE staff (ECE&FS and OSE) MICC
<b>Discussion:</b> The lack of an effective and efficient general supervision system had a negative impact on Michigan's ability to complete the FFY 2005 APR and on Michigan's determination from OSEP. Michigan will work with the assigned NCRRC representative to examine the existing system of general supervision and to make improvements to the three basic components to allow for more timely and effective monitoring, notification of noncompliance, guidance, and verification of correction of noncompliance.		
<b>Activity:</b> Develop a database for tracking all segments of the general supervision system: findings, corrective action plans, quarterly reports, progress, and verification of compliance, determinations, and sanctions.	Spring 2008-2012	MDE staff CIMS contractor
<b>Discussion:</b> Michigan, through the Continuous Improvement Monitoring System II (CIMS-2), is currently tracking and aligning above segments of the general supervision system. A database will ensure that no pieces are lost.		
<b>Activity:</b> Develop a more effective and efficient system of tracking findings and correction of noncompliance.	Fall 2008-2012	CIMS contractor MDE staff (ECE&FS and OSE)
<b>Discussion:</b> As Michigan is tracking corrections of noncompliance, it is becoming evident that a more effective system needs to be put in place to track the timeframes of correction of noncompliance. It is becoming evident that Michigan must create a database that can track corrections of noncompliance from several years.		
In April 2009, Michigan began using CIMS-2. CIMS-2 allows MDE to track all findings made and progress towards compliance. CIMS-2 also notes when a finding has been verified and closed. This allows MDE to track all findings in one data system, allowing for more accurate reporting.		
<b>Activity:</b> Train local early intervention personnel on the new CIMS-2 process.	Spring 2008-2012	CIMS contractor MDE staff (ECE&FS and OSE)

**Discussion:** Michigan has made significant changes to the CIMS process. Local early intervention programs in April 2009 engaged in a process of data analysis as opposed to a self review. Findings are embedded into the CIMS-2 process. Activities and corrective action plans and/or improvement plans are required when noncompliance is found. In order for local early intervention programs to navigate through the CIMS-2 process, training is required.

From October 2008 through April 2009 and ongoing, MDE has trained all local early intervention staff on the process of CIMS-2. Many meetings were held throughout the state and an online course is available. In addition, there is a helpline for any questions that come up with regard to CIMS-2.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011 (if applicable):**

No revisions at this time.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

See page 1 of this APR.

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

**Indicator 10:** Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:**

The Part C complaints do not meet the threshold of ten for FFY 2010.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2010:**

N/A

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011 (if applicable):**

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
<b>Activity:</b> The <i>Early On</i> system will monitor informal complaints to identify areas of improvement.	Fall 2011	MDE staff

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

See page 1 of this APR.

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

**Indicator 11:** Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:**  
Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:**

No due process hearings were requested in FFY 2010.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2010:**

N/A

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011 (if applicable):**

N/A

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

See page 1 of this APR.

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

**Indicator 12:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:**

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

**FFY 2010 Measurable and Rigorous Target**

Michigan Part C did not meet the threshold of ten hearing requests.

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:**

No Part C hearings were requested in FFY 2010.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:**

N/A

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011 (if applicable):**

N/A

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

See page 1 of this APR.

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

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

**Measurement:**

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

**FFY 2010 Measurable and Rigorous Target**

Michigan Part C did not meet the threshold of ten mediation requests.

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:**

No Part C mediations were held in FFY 2009.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2010:**

N/A

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011 (if applicable):**

N/A

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

See page 1 of this APR.

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

**Indicator 14:** State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:**

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:**

The State reported data, including 618 and the SPP, were each submitted on time.

The 618 data reporting child count, including race and ethnicity, were submitted by February 1, 2010.

The exiting, personnel, and dispute resolution 618 data were reported by November 1, 2010.

Indicator 14 - SPP/APR Data			
APR Indicator	Valid and reliable	Correct calculation	Total
1	1	1	2
2	1	1	2
3	1	1	2
4	1	1	2
5	1	1	2
6	1	1	2
7	1	1	2
8A	1	1	2
8B	1	1	2
8C	1	1	2
9	1	1	2
10	1	1	2
11	1	1	2
12	1	1	2
13	1	1	2
		<b>Subtotal</b>	30

# APR Template – Part C (4)

<b>APR Score Calculation</b>	<b>Timely Submission Points</b> - If the FFY 2010 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
	<b>Grand Total</b> – (Sum of subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	35

618 Data – Indicator 14					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Date Note Requests	Total
Table 1 – Child Count Due Date: 2/2/11	1	1	1	1	4
Table 2 – Program Settings Due Date: 2/2/11	1	1	1	1	4
Table 3 – Exiting Due Date: 11/2/11	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 4 – Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/2/11	1	1	1	N/A	3
				<b>Subtotal</b>	14
<b>618 Score Calculation</b>			<b>Grand Total</b> (subtotal x 2.5)		35

Indicator #14 Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	35.00
B. 618 Grand Total	35.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	70.00
Total N/A in APR	0.00
Total N/A in 618	0.00
<b>Base</b>	<b>70.00</b>
D. Subtotal (C divided by Base*) =	1.000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.0

\* Note any cell marked as N/A will decrease the denominator by 1 for APR and 2.5 for 618

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2010:**

There has been discussion regarding the proposed list of changes for the data fields. Changes to the proposed data fields were initiated this program year. Additionally, the data collection contractor has also started the migration to a new web-based data system.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011 (if applicable):**

N/A