State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report: Part C

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

For reporting on FFY18

Michigan

PART C DUE February 3, 2020

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

The Lead Agency for Part C, or Early On®, 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 child well-being agency, mental health, and public health to implement the early intervention system for infants and toddlers with disablities or developmental delays and their families. The three state-level service partners are now part of one agency, the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS). We also partner with the Inter-Tribal Council of Michigan.

There are 56 intermediate school districts (ISDs) responsible for the administration of Early On across the state. Each local early intervention system (LEIS) is required to have a Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) to provide an advisory body for its system of services. The LICCs are patterned after the Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC) requiring representative stakeholders as well as parent membership.

The Annual Performance Report (APR) development process included input from MDHHS, data collected by various contractors, and a review by the MICC. Contactors and MDE's state-level data collection entity ensure that indicator-specific data are collected, certified, and submitted to MDE for final confirmation. Data sources include local data collection programs submitting data to the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) which is then analyzed by the Part C 618 data contractor, as well as collection and analysis completed under a subgrant with Wayne State University (WSU). A series of meetings were held to review and utilize the confirmed data to develop appropriate activities. Data coordination meetings helped to align work and decrease redundancy of efforts.

In Michigan, Parts B and C have been engaged in the development of Catamaran, a comprehensive online monitoring/accountability system. 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. Continuous improvement is a constant goal, so enhancements were initiated to the monitoring/accountability system in response to needs of the users. There are three monitoring components to Catamaran: (1) Focused Monitoring; (2) Data Analysis, which includes a process for notifying LEISs of findings which require corrective action plans for compliance indicators; and (3) Verification.

Verification that each LEIS is correctly implementing a specific regulatory requirement starts with MDE reviewing MSDS data submitted by each LEIS. If data submitted and reviewed by MDE in response to corrective action plans indicate correction, then verification is complete. If a deeper analysis is required, MDE will request the LEIS submit a random sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever is greater, from the local program child files within the reporting period. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the federal and state standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. Notification of noncompliance is made in the Catamaran system. For all child-level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the LEIS through a child-level corrective action form in Catamaran. The LEISs are given a deadline by which they must 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 noted earlier. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family.

A copy of the Michigan Part C of IDEA State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) can be downloaded at www.michigan.gov/earlyon.

General Supervision System

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

A Michigan Part C comprehensive general supervision system is in place to assist in achieving improved results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and/or a developmental delay and their families. Various components of the system are briefly discussed below.

MDE is the lead agency for the implementation of Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Part C of IDEA is commonly known as Early On within the state. Leadership for Early On is located in the Office of Great Start/Early Childhood Development and Family Education (OGS/ECD&FE). There are 56 ISDs responsible for the administration of Early On across the state. Each LEIS is required to have an LICC to provide advice for its system of services. The LICCs are patterned after the MICC, requiring representative stakeholders as well as parent membership.

Early On partners and collaborates with the MICC, the state interagency coordinating council. MDE staff reviewed available data along with statewide contractors, members of the MICC Executive Committee, and the Parent Involvement Committee (PIC). After several data review meetings, target recommendations were presented to the MICC at their November 2014 meeting. Each November, the MICC reviews current data in comparison to the previously set targets.

Data Collection for Part C reporting requirements are collected from three sources: 1) the Michigan Electronic Grants System Plus (MEGS+); 2) MSDS; and 3) the Qualitative Compliance Information Project (QCIP), Michigan's confidential system for reporting family outcomes. Local lead agencies collect basic demographic data on all children enrolled in Early On, assigning a unique identification code (UIC) to each child. Those data are then uploaded from individual local data management systems into MSDS. MSDS builds a secure, confidential record of elements needed for federal reporting.

Fiscal management of LEIS and statewide contracts is controlled using MEGS+ and the Cash Management System (CMS). All fiscal agents must apply for Part C funds through this system. Budgets and subsequent amendments are approved by lead agency staff. Distribution of reimbursement payments are conducted and final expenditure reports are filed via CMS.

An effective dispute resolution system is in place with the support of Michigan's Office of Special Education (OSE), the lead office for Part B of IDEA. OSE provides oversight and administration for mediation, complaints, and due process hearings for both Part C and Part B of IDEA.

Mediations in the state are processed by Special Education Mediation Services (SEMS), formerly known as Michigan Special Education Mediation Program (mikids1st.org). SEMS provides mediation, facilitation, and training services for working through disagreements so that children with disabilities promptly receive the services they need to develop and succeed in school. SEMS provides services through a network of 18 conflict resolution centers across the state. The project uses mediation, facilitation, and training services for working through disputes. The mediation process is intended to resolve disputes by sharing ideas on what the child needs. The process helps participants find solutions for the good of the child and family in a non-legal way, thereby avoiding a lengthy and expensive court process. The use of mediation is voluntary and has to be agreed to by both the parent and the local early intervention system.

Complaints filed with the state are processed by OSE. OSE has a very organized system to track and process complaints. OSE utilizes a single-tier complaint system. All state complaints are completed using this system. This single-tier system allows the early intervention systems and OSE to jointly investigate complaints resulting in the opportunity to encourage and support the use of local resolution and methods of alternative dispute resolution.

Due Process Hearings in Michigan are processed in a single-tier system that uses hearing officers who are administrative law judges. The hearing officers are salaried state employees employed by a state department separate from MDE. It is required that the hearing officers are knowledgeable and understand the provisions of IDEA, federal and state regulations, and all relevant legal interpretations. This separate agency is the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS).

The monitoring system used by OSE and OGS/ECD&FE is an online system named Catamaran. The state uses this system to ensure compliance with IDEA and any state rule and to promote outcomes. This system was designed to help the state and ISDs analyze and interpret data, as well as record all monitoring activities in a single location. It reflects the priorities of IDEA and the State Performance Plan (SPP). In assessing the performance of its locals, the state monitors data collected through the following:
o Focused monitoring activities (on-site, state-verified desk audit or state-verified self-review),
o Data reviews, and
o Other activities.

Michigan evaluates the performance of each local early intervention system, relative to the SPP indicator targets. If areas of noncompliance are identified, the state issues a finding of noncompliance to the LEIS.

A Finding is a dated, written notification that includes both the citation of the statute, rule or regulation, and a description of the data supporting the state's conclusion that there is noncompliance with that statute or regulation. There are two prongs of verification of correction used by the state: Prong 1 – The local has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, and Prong 2 – The local is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on the state's review of new data per established indicator time frames.

All identified noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year, including verification.

Policies, procedures, and the SPP/APR are in place to provide guidance to the field. The Michigan State Plan for Part C of IDEA provides a general overview to the federal requirements. The State Plan, additional guidance, and implementation can be found on the MDE, Early On, and Early On Training and Technical Assistance websites; which are available to the public. The three website addresses are:
Michigan Department of Education: www.michigan.gov/earlyon
Early On: www.1800EarlyOn.org
Early On Training and Technical Assistance: www.eotta.ccresa.org

Technical Assistance System:

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

Technical Assistance (TA) is provided by a statewide contractor, Early On Training and Technical Assistance (EOT&TA), at Clinton County Regional Educational Service Agency. TA is a component of the comprehensive system of personnel development provided by this same contractor. Staff of EOT&TA participate in numerous national initiatives and activities to stay abreast of current practices. The contractor provides TA to local early intervention systems through a variety of methods including guidance documents, phone contacts, email, one-on-one TA for each of the local systems, and onsite meetings. A daily toll-free line is available for early intervention personnel to ask questions. This contractor also provides TA after state monitoring to assist the LEIS to come into compliance.

Each LEIS also receives TA from state lead agency staff. Three state Education Consultants (Civil Service classification title for professional employees) are assigned a cohort of local systems to provide TA in addition to support from EOT&TA. State staff and EOT&TA work closely to coordinate support to the local systems. State staff TA is at the policy level to clarify guidance where needed at the local level.

Professional Development System:

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

Comprehensive system of personnel development: Through issuance of a mandated activities project grant, Michigan has developed a comprehensive system of personnel development, including the training of paraprofessionals and the training of primary referral sources with respect to the basic components of an early intervention system available in the state that includes:

• Training personnel in implementing innovative strategies and activities for the recruitment and retention of Early On service providers,
• Promoting the preparation of Early On service providers who are fully and appropriately qualified to provide early intervention services under Part C, and
• Training personnel to coordinate transition services for infants and toddlers in geographic areas throughout the state.

This contractor also has the responsibility of providing timely delivery of high quality, evidenced-based technical assistance and support to LEIS. Supports to the field include a resourceful website, online and in-person training, webinars, system updates sessions, conferences, and communities of practice. Participation in national communities of practice and TA events provide contractors the most current and up-to-date information.

A self-paced, five-part training module for personnel development entitled "Essentials for Early On" is available to support providers in the field to understand expectations for those evaluating infants and toddlers. State staff worked to enable continuing education credits for those completing the on-line course.

The Early On Center for Higher Education is Michigan's pre-service initiative to support the development of highly qualified early intervention personnel to work with infants and toddlers, birth to three, with disabilities and/or special needs, and their families. The Early On Center works with faculty to strengthen learning experiences for 2-year and 4-year college students so they are knowledgeable of Early On Michigan and competent in their future work with families of infants and toddlers.

Each LEIS also receives TA from state staff. Three MDE team members are assigned a cohort of ISDs to provide TA in addition to support from EOT&TA. State staff and EOT&TA work closely to coordinate support to the local systems. State staff TA is at the policy level to clarify guidance where needed at the local level.

Stakeholder Involvement:

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

Michigan Part C collaborates extensively with the MICC, the Governor-appointed advisory council. The MICC includes multiple stakeholders from various perspectives around the state. Issues are addressed through various ad hoc and standing committees. The Executive and Parent Involvement committees provide significant advice to the lead agency. When targets need to be established or revised, these committees, along with statewide contractors, review data and make recommendations for the targets. After several data review meetings, target recommendations were presented to the MICC at the November 2014 meeting. Each November the MICC reviews current data in comparison to the previously set targets. At the November 2018 meeting, the MICC recommended the Results indicator targets remain the same through FFY 2019. They also recommended the formation of a Data Ad Hoc Committee to advise MDE around target setting through FFY 2024.

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

Reporting to the Public:

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

As required by law, public reporting occurs no later than 120 days from submission of the SPP/APR. Michigan's Part C SPP/APR can be found at www.michigan.gov/earlyon under the heading Federal Reports/Performance.

The FFY 2017 public report on the performance of each LEIS for all of the required indicators was posted on the three websites for Early On listed below:
Michigan Department of Education: www.michigan.gov/earlyon or www.MiSchoolData.org, and Early On: www.1800EarlyOn.org.

A communication was released by MDE's Office of Public and Government Affairs directing stakeholders to MDE's site.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

Intro - OSEP Response

The State did not provide verification that the Indicator C-11/SSIP attachment included in its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission is in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), as required by Section 508 and noted in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR User Guides and technical webinar.

The State provided a FFY 2019 target for Indicator C-11/State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and OSEP accepts that target.

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

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

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

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2006	47.80%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.83%	99.07%	99.60%	99.84%	99.86%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
19,503	19,724	99.86%	100%	99.89%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

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

200

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

30 calendar days from consent for the services

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

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

Full reporting period - July 1, 2018 - June 30, 2019

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

Data from the full reporting period are included.

If needed, provide additional information about this indicator here.

Data were collected through the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS). All local early intervention systems (LEIS) submitted data regarding all children served to the state database at three designated points during the program year (July 1, 2018 - June 30, 2019). Data from the three collections were aggregated to provide data from the full reporting period.

Data for this indicator reflect a total of 19,724 children's records include new services on either initial or subsequent IFSPs. This number was used as the denominator for calculation of Indicator 1 data. Reported data reflect that for 19,503 children all new services listed on their IFSP were initiated within the required timeline of 30 calendar days from consent for the services. An additional 200 records indicated delays to the initiation of services were attributable to documented exceptional family circumstances. The number of records with documented exceptional family circumstances (200) was added to the timely records (19,503) resulting in a total of 19,703 records. This number was used as the numerator for the calculation. The resulting percentage of compliance is 99.89%.

Both the numerator and denominator include 200 children for whom services were not timely, but whose records indicated that the delays were attributable to documented exceptional family circumstances. 99.89% compliance falls slightly below the target of 100% for this indicator. This compliance level is higher than the 99.86% compliance level reported in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR.

Thirty-eight of the 56 LEISs had a total of 200 records with delays to the start of services that had documented exceptional family circumstances. Reasons for these delays include child or family illness, accommodating family schedules, appointments being cancelled and rescheduled by parents, documented multiple attempts to contact parents for scheduling, family not being at home at scheduled appointment times, family moving, parent not providing consent, and other child or parent reasons.

Eleven of the 56 LEISs had a total of 21 records with delays to the start of services for which exceptional family circumstances did not exist or were not documented. Reasons for these delays include provider availability, lack of training/knowledge on the part of personnel, and other provider reasons.

Eight of the 11 LEISs with delays to the start of services for which exceptional family circumstances did not exist or were not documented were issued Findings of noncompliance and required to develop Corrective Action Plans during FFY 2019 based on these FFY 2018 data. Three of the 11 LEISs with delays to the start of services for which exceptional family circumstances did not exist or were not documented were not issued Findings of noncompliance because they already had an open Finding/Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for this indicator.

Findings resulting from FFY 2018 data are based on the full reporting period; therefore, Findings based on FFY 2018 data are issued in FFY 2019.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
7	5	2	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Seven LEISs were issued a Finding for Indicator 1 in FFY 2017 based on a review of their data submitted within MSDS.

Each LEIS developed a CAP in Catamaran that detailed strategies that the LEIS 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. Progress reports required the LEIS to conduct file reviews.

When CAP activities had been completed and progress reports indicated compliance, MDE conducted verification activities. MDE reviewed the most recent data submitted to MSDS to determine whether the LEIS had achieved 100% compliance. All records for each LEIS were found to be in compliance resulting in a 100% compliance level.

Documentation was also collected from the LEISs and from the state TA providers to demonstrate that all CAP activities had been completed. Each LEIS was notified of the verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter closing the CAP.

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

For each of the children for whom services were not initiated within the 30-day timeline from consent for services, it was verified by the state as part of the verification of correction process that all services on the IFSP were indeed initiated, though not timely, or that the child was no longer under the jurisdiction of the local early intervention system. During the corrective action plan process within the Catamaran system, the LEIS was required to provide documentation for the initiation of all services on the IFSP for each of the children for whom services had not been initiated within the 30-day timeline from consent for services. For these children, no further child level correction was possible because timeliness cannot be corrected. The LEIS could also indicate that the child had been exited and was no longer under the jurisdiction of the LEIS. For these children, correction was not possible.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

1 - OSEP Response

The State did not demonstrate that the EIS program or provider corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

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

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

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

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	84.20%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target>=	93.00%	93.50%	93.50%	94.00%	94.00%
Data	96.34%	95.00%	95.28%	96.47%	97.10%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=	94.00%	94.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input
Michigan Part C collaborates extensively with the MICC, the Governor-appointed advisory council. The MICC includes multiple stakeholders from various perspectives around the state. Issues are addressed through various ad hoc and standing committees. The Executive and Parent Involvement committees provide significant advice to the lead agency. When targets need to be established or revised, these committees, along with statewide contractors, review data and make recommendations for the targets. After several data review meetings, target recommendations were presented to the MICC at the November 2014 meeting. Each November the MICC reviews current data in comparison to the previously set targets. At the November 2018 meeting, the MICC recommended the Results indicator targets remain the same through FFY 2019. They also recommended the formation of a Data Ad Hoc Committee to advise MDE around target setting through FFY 2024.

See Introduction for stakeholder involvement.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	10,689
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	11,025

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of Infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
10,689	11,025	97.10%	94.00%	96.95%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

2 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:
>   A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
>   B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
>   C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

Data Source
State selected data source.

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

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

d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

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

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

Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3 - Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Michigan Part C collaborates extensively with the MICC, the Governor-appointed advisory council. The MICC includes multiple stakeholders from various perspectives around the state. Issues are addressed through various ad hoc and standing committees. The Executive and Parent Involvement committees provide significant advice to the lead agency. When targets need to be established or revised, these committees, along with statewide contractors, review data and make recommendations for the targets. After several data review meetings, target recommendations were presented to the MICC at the November 2014 meeting. Each November the MICC reviews current data in comparison to the previously set targets. At the November 2018 meeting, the MICC recommended the Results indicator targets remain the same through FFY 2019. They also recommended the formation of a Data Ad Hoc Committee to advise MDE around target setting through FFY 2024.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2008	Target>=	75.00%	75.30%	75.60%	75.90%	76.20%
A1	74.00%	Data	78.21%	64.00%	74.82%	76.49%	75.19%
A2	2008	Target>=	60.40%	60.50%	60.60%	60.70%	60.80%
A2	59.20%	Data	54.19%	54.79%	54.26%	54.06%	52.15%
B1	2008	Target>=	79.50%	79.70%	79.90%	80.10%	80.30%
B1	79.10%	Data	80.94%	67.60%	79.08%	80.04%	78.72%
B2	2008	Target>=	51.20%	51.80%	52.40%	53.00%	53.60%
B2	54.00%	Data	48.63%	49.04%	48.79%	48.33%	47.27%
C1	2008	Target>=	78.80%	79.00%	79.20%	79.40%	79.60%
C1	78.10%	Data	81.10%	68.17%	78.30%	80.40%	78.24%
C2	2008	Target>=	59.20%	59.40%	59.60%	59.80%	60.00%
C2	59.40%	Data	52.44%	51.95%	49.89%	50.29%	47.54%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1>=	76.50%	76.50%
Target A2>=	60.90%	60.90%
Target B1>=	80.50%	80.50%
Target B2>=	54.10%	54.10%
Target C1>=	79.80%	79.80%
Target C2>=	60.20%	60.20%

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

6,336

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	11	0.17%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,195	18.86%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,757	27.73%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,221	35.05%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,152	18.18%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	3,978	5,184	75.19%	76.50%	76.74%	Met Target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	3,373	6,336	52.15%	60.90%	53.24%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	10	0.16%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,172	18.50%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,105	33.22%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,432	38.38%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	617	9.74%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	4,537	5,719	78.72%	80.50%	79.33%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	3,049	6,336	47.27%	54.10%	48.12%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	13	0.21%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,176	18.56%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,938	30.59%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,448	38.64%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	761	12.01%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	4,386	5,575	78.24%	79.80%	78.67%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	3,209	6,336	47.54%	60.20%	50.65%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Will your separate report be just the at-risk infants and toddlers or aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C?

XXX

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A1	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A1 AR	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A1 AR	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A2	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A2	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A2 AR	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A2 AR	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B1	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B1	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B1 AR	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B1 AR	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B2	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B2	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B2 AR	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B2 AR	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C1	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C1	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C1 AR	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C1 AR	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C2	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C2	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C2 AR	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C2 AR	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	XXX	XXX
A1 AR	XXX	XXX
Target A2 >=	XXX	XXX
A2 AR	XXX	XXX
Target B1 >=	XXX	XXX
B1 AR	XXX	XXX
Target B2 >=	XXX	XXX
B2 AR	XXX	XXX
Target C1 >=	XXX	XXX
C1 AR	XXX	XXX
Target C2 >=	XXX	XXX
C2 AR	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed
XXX

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

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	XXX	XXX
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	XXX	XXX
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	XXX	XXX
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	XXX	XXX
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable
XXX

Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable
XXX

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for A1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for A2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	XXX	XXX
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	XXX	XXX
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	XXX	XXX
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	XXX	XXX
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for B1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for B2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	XXX	XXX
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	XXX	XXX
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	XXX	XXX
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	XXX	XXX
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable
XXX

Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable
XXX

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for C1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable
XXX

Provide reasons for C2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable
XXX

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

The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's Part C exiting 618 data	11,353
The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.	3,256

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

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

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

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

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.
Every child is rated on each of the three child outcome functional areas using the Child Outcome Summary (COS) seven-point rating scale. Impact is based upon the child's progress by comparing his/her developmental status between the entry (collected within 90 days of the referral date) and the exit ratings (collected within 90 days prior to exit date and after at least six months of continuous service). Rating differences between the two data points measure change or progress. At exit, the service provider(s) not only rate the child on the seven-point rating scale, but also answer the question with a "yes" or "no" about whether the child acquired any new skills or behaviors. Entry ratings, exit ratings, and answers to the "new skill" questions are all required. If the child's record is missing any of this information, the progress data will not be available for this child. Using the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center Calculator, progress for each child is then converted into one of the five OSEP categories (A-E), indicating the degree to which the child's status has changed between the time he or she entered and exited Early On. Local service areas submitted demographic and assessment information on child entry or exit in Early On through the MSDS. Multiple sources of information, such as assessments, IFSPs, and parent input are collected to help determine the child's functioning across the three outcomes to determine the COS ratings. The COS is a standardized method of reporting a child's developmental status using the seven-point COS rating scale. Ongoing assessment information and/or state-approved assessment tool results are used when establishing COS ratings.

A variety of tools are used to gather information to assist in determining entry and exit COS ratings. Below is a list of the most common tools used. This is not an exhaustive list.

Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System for Infants and Children (AEPS)
Battelle Developmental Inventory Second Addition Bayley
Brigance
Carolina
Early Leaning Intervention Developmental Profile Revised Edition (EIDP)
Early Learning Accomplishment Profile Kit (E-LAP)
Hawaii Early Learning Profile (HELP)
Infant-Toddler Developmental Assessment Kit (IDA)
Other: An assessment tool not listed above

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3 - Prior FFY Required Actions
None
Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3 - OSEP Response
The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3 - Required Actions

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

    A. Know their rights;

    B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and

    C. Help their children develop and learn.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

    A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

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

    C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

Instructions

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

4 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2005	Target>=	58.40%	58.60%	58.80%	59.00%	59.20%
A	56.00%	Data	70.08%	70.65%	69.07%	69.21%	71.12%
B	2005	Target>=	53.40%	53.60%	53.80%	54.00%	54.20%
B	51.00%	Data	63.98%	63.75%	62.81%	62.73%	64.75%
C	2005	Target>=	77.40%	77.60%	77.80%	78.00%	78.20%
C	73.00%	Data	84.40%	84.05%	83.98%	84.14%	84.06%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A>=	59.40%	59.40%
Target B>=	54.40%	54.40%
Target C>=	78.40%	78.40%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Michigan Part C collaborates extensively with the MICC, the Governor-appointed advisory council. The MICC includes multiple stakeholders from various perspectives around the state. Issues are addressed through various ad hoc and standing committees. The Executive and Parent Involvement committees provide significant advice to the lead agency. When targets need to be established or revised, these committees, along with statewide contractors, review data and make recommendations for the targets. After several data review meetings, target recommendations were presented to the MICC at the November 2014 meeting. Each November the MICC reviews current data in comparison to the previously set targets. At the November 2018 meeting, the MICC recommended the Results indicator targets remain the same through FFY 2019. They also recommended the formation of a Data Ad Hoc Committee to advise MDE around target setting through FFY 2024.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	7,467
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	2,965
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	2,111
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	2,965
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	1,923
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	2,965
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	2,530
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	2,965

	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2)	71.12%	59.40%	71.20%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2)	64.75%	54.40%	64.86%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2)	84.06%	78.40%	85.33%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for part A slippage, if applicable
XXX

Provide reasons for part B slippage, if appilcable
XXX

Provide reasons for part C slippage, if applicable
XXX

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

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

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

If not, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

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

Survey data were collected through multiple modes: online, mail, and telephone interview. A 1-800 toll-free number was offered to parents for questions and comments. The telephone interview was also offered in Spanish and Arabic.The online survey data were stored in a secure server as respondents completed the surveys via the web. Completed mail surveys were processed using a data scanning software, also stored in a secure server. Surveys completed by telephone were stored through the computer assisted telephone interview (CATI) software and in a secure server. All completed surveys were then merged into a statistical package database, and several levels of data quality control measures (audit, verification, deduping, etc.) were performed. This year's data represent the State Part C population well in terms of children's age, gender, and ethnicity.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Compared to other states that have also adopted the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) 22-Item Scale, Rasch analysis, and the three standards, Michigan's results are consistent with those states.

Michigan selected the NCSEAM Impact of Early Intervention Services on Your Family Scale to collect data on Indicator 4. The Scale has two important qualities necessary for use as a measure of Indicator 4: validity and high reliability.

The Scale exhibits evidence of both content and construct validity. To ensure good content validity, the items in the scale were suggested by parents and other key stakeholders in early intervention and special education and then reviewed by experts in the field. Rasch analysis was used to ensure the items formed a unidimensional scale so that all items address the same construct.

In the NCSEAM pilot study, the Scale had a reliability coefficient of .90. The reliability coefficient found in Michigan's administration of the scale was 0.93 for 2019 (FFY 2018). Another form of reliability is assessed by the margin of error or confidence interval. Using a 95% confidence interval, the margin of error was ±1.43 for 2019 (FFY 2018).

Per the recommendation of the NCSEAM researchers who developed the Scale, and since the Scale was constructed using the Rasch measurement framework, "a Rasch analysis provides an estimate of the reliability of both the calibration values (related to the items) and the measures (related to people's responses)." In addition, the measure (average result based on Rasch) can be directly interpreted with respect to the items defining the Scale – that is, one can identify specific items to guide improvement activities.

4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

FFY 2018 data are representative in terms of ethnicity for the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program. Many strategies were utilized to address having a representative sample, 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.

4 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

4 - Required Actions

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

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

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	1.03%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target >=	1.24%	1.24%	1.24%	1.25%	1.26%
Data	1.18%	1.16%	1.13%	1.30%	1.38%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	1.27%	1.27%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Michigan Part C collaborates extensively with the MICC, the Governor-appointed advisory council. The MICC includes multiple stakeholders from various perspectives around the state. Issues are addressed through various ad hoc and standing committees. The Executive and Parent Involvement committees provide significant advice to the lead agency. When targets need to be established or revised, these committees, along with statewide contractors, review data and make recommendations for the targets. After several data review meetings, target recommendations were presented to the MICC at the November 2014 meeting. Each November the MICC reviews current data in comparison to the previously set targets. At the November 2018 meeting, the MICC recommended the Results indicator targets remain the same through FFY 2019. They also recommended the formation of a Data Ad Hoc Committee to advise MDE around target setting through FFY 2024.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	1,400
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/20/2019	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	110,301

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1,400	110,301	1.38%	1.27%	1.27%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Compare your results to the national data

The national average for FY2018 was 1.25%. Michigan's data for this indicator is .12% above the national average.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

5 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

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

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Baseline	2005	2.20%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target >=	2.70%	2.70%	2.70%	2.80%	2.90%
Data	2.64%	2.62%	2.60%	2.86%	3.08%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	3.00%	3.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Michigan Part C collaborates extensively with the MICC, the Governor-appointed advisory council. The MICC includes multiple stakeholders from various perspectives around the state. Issues are addressed through various ad hoc and standing committees. The Executive and Parent Involvement committees provide significant advice to the lead agency. When targets need to be established or revised, these committees, along with statewide contractors, review data and make recommendations for the targets. After several data review meetings, target recommendations were presented to the MICC at the November 2014 meeting. Each November the MICC reviews current data in comparison to the previously set targets. At the November 2018 meeting, the MICC recommended the Results indicator targets remain the same through FFY 2019. They also recommended the formation of a Data Ad Hoc Committee to advise MDE around target setting through FFY 2024.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	11,025
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/20/2019	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	338,573

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
11,025	338,573	3.08%	3.00%	3.26%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Compare your results to the national data

The national average for FY2018 was 3.48 %. Michigan's data for this indicator is .22% below the national average.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

6 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2006	63.10%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.12%	95.07%	96.81%	99.12%	98.97%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
9,945	11,929	98.97%	100%	99.20%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

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

1,889

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

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

Full reporting period - July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019.

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

Full reporting period is included.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data were collected through the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS). All local early intervention systems (LEISs) submitted data regarding all children served to the state database at three designated points during the program year (July 1, 2018 - June 30, 2019). Data from the three collections were aggregated to provide data for the full reporting period.

Data reported for this indicator reflect that a total of 11,929 records included eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted. This number was used as the denominator for calculation of Indicator 7 data. Data reported reflect that 9,945 of the records documented that an initial evaluation, an initial assessment, and the initial IFSP meeting were completed within the 45-day timeline. An additional 1,889 records contained documentation that the delays to the completion of the initial evaluation, initial assessment, and initial IFSP meeting were attributable to exceptional family circumstances. The number of records with documented exceptional family circumstances (1,889) was added to the timely records (9,945) resulting in a total of 11,834 records. This number was used as the numerator for the calculation. The resulting percentage compliance is 99.20%.

(9,945+1,889)/11,929=99.20)

Both the numerator and the denominator include 1,889 children for whom completion of the initial evaluation, initial assessment, and initial IFSP meeting was not timely, but whose records contained documentation that the delays were attributable to exceptional family circumstances. 99.20% compliance falls below the target of 100% for this indicator. This compliance level is higher than the 98.97% compliance level reported in the FFY 2017 APR.

Fifty-one of 56 LEISs had a total of 1,889 records with delays attributable to documented exceptional family circumstances. Reasons for these delays include illness of the child or a family member, appointments being cancelled and rescheduled by parents, parents requesting a delay to the evaluation or IFSP meeting to accommodate family schedules, documented multiple attempts to contact parents for scheduling, family moved, family not being at home at scheduled appointment times, or other child or family reasons.

Sixteen of 56 LEISs had a total of 95 records with untimely completion of initial evaluations, initial assessments, and initial IFSP meetings for which exceptional family circumstances did not exist or were not documented. Reasons for these delays include provider availability, confusion regarding requirements, or other provider reasons.

Eleven of the 16 LEISs with untimely completion of initial evaluations, initial assessments, and initial IFSP meetings for which exceptional family circumstances did not exist or were not documented were issued Findings of noncompliance and were required to develop Corrective Action Plans (CAPs) during FFY 2019 based on this FFY 2018 data. The remaining five of the 16 local service areas were not issued new Findings, as they had open Findings and CAPs for Indicator 7, or a review of more recent data during verification and closeout of previously issued Findings and CAPs for Indicator 7 indicated 100% compliance.

Findings resulting from FFY 2018 data are based on the full reporting period; therefore, Findings based on FFY 2018 data are issued in FFY 2019.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
12	12	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Twelve of 56 LEISs were issued Findings for Indicator 7 in FFY 2017 based on a review of their data submitted within MSDS.

Each of the 12 LEISs developed a CAP in Catamaran that detailed strategies that the LEIS 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. Progress reports required the LEIS to conduct file reviews.

When CAP activities had been completed and progress reports indicated compliance, MDE conducted verification activities. MDE reviewed the most recent data submitted to MSDS to determine whether the LEIS had achieved 100% compliance. All records for each LEIS were found to be in compliance resulting in a 100% compliance level within one year of notification of the noncompliance.

Documentation was also collected from each LEIS and from the state technical assistance providers to demonstrate that all CAP activities had been completed. Each LEIS was notified of the verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter closing the CAP.

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

For each of the children for whom MSDS data revealed that the IFSP was not completed within the 45 calendar-day timeline, it was verified as part of the data review that an IFSP was completed for each of the children, though not within the 45-day timeline. No further child level correction was possible because timeliness cannot be corrected.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

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

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

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

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

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

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions
None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;

B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and

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

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	59.28%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	99.45%	92.89%	95.91%	97.70%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

If no, please explain.

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
7,608	8,431	97.70%	100%	98.96%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

735

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

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

Full reporting period - July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019

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

Data from full reporting period are included.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data were collected through the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS). All local early intervention systems (LEISs) submitted data regarding all children served to the state database at three designated points during the program year (July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2019).

Data from the three collections were aggregated to provide data from the full reporting period.

Data reported for this indicator reflect that the total of 8,431 records included eligible infants and toddlers for whom transition planning, including an IFSP developed with transition steps and services, was required to be conducted. This number was used as the denominator for calculation of Indicator 8a data. Data reported for this indicator reflect that 7,608 of the records documented timely transition planning including an IFSP developed with transition steps and services. An additional 735 records contained documentation that delays to the completion of transition planning, including an IFSP developed with transition steps and services, were attributable to exceptional family circumstances. The number of records with documented exceptional family circumstances (735) was added to the timely records (7,608) resulting in a total of 8,343 records. This number was used as the numerator for the calculation. The resulting percentage of compliance is 98.96%.

(7,608+735)/8,431=.9896

Both the numerator and the denominator include 735 children for whom IFSPs with transition steps and services were not timely, but whose records contained documentation that the delays were attributable to exceptional family circumstances. 98.96% compliance falls below the target of 100% compliance for this indicator. These data reflect an increase for this indicator from the 97.7% compliance level reported in the FFY 2017 APR.

Forty-nine of 56 LEISs reported delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances for a total of 735 children. Documented reasons for these delays include illness or hospitalization of child or family members, multiple unsuccessful attempts to contact family to set appointment, accommodating family schedule, meetings being rescheduled at parent request, cancellation or family not being home at scheduled appointment times, family moved, and other child or parent reasons.

Twenty-two of 56 LEISs reported delays that were not attributable to exceptional family circumstances for a total of 88 children. Reasons for these delays include provider availability, lack of personnel training/knowledge, other provider reasons, and failure to report transition plan timeliness data.

Ten of the 22 LEISs with reported delays that were not attributable to exceptional family circumstance were issued Findings of noncompliance and required to develop Corrective Action Plans (CAPs) during FFY 2019 based on this FFY 2018 data. The remaining 12 of the 22 LEISs were not issued new Findings, as they had open Findings and CAPs for Indicator 8a or a review of more recent data during verification and closeout of previously issued Findings and CAPs for Indicator 8a indicated 100% compliance.

Findings resulting from FFY 2018 data are based on the full reporting period; therefore, Findings based on FFY 2018 data are issued in FFY 2019.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Four LEISs were issued a Finding related to Indicator 8a in FFY 2017 based on a review of data submitted within MSDS.

Each LEIS developed a CAP in Catamaran that detailed strategies the LEIS 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. Progress reports required the LEIS to conduct file reviews.

When CAP activities had been completed and progress reports indicated compliance, MDE conducted verification activities. MDE reviewed the most recent data submitted in MSDS to determine whether the LEIS had achieved 100% compliance. Records for all four LEISs were found to be in compliance resulting in a 100% compliance level within one year of notification of the noncompliance.

Documentation was also collected from the LEISs and from the state technical assistance (TA) providers to demonstrate that all CAP activities had been completed.

The LEISs were notified of the verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter closing the CAP.

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

For some of the children, transition planning including an IFSP developed with transition steps and services did take place but not within the required timeline. For these children, the LEIS was required to provide documentation that transition planning including an IFSP developed with transition steps and services, was indeed completed. No further child level correction is possible because timeliness cannot be corrected. The other impacted children were no longer under the jurisdiction of the local early intervention system. Child level correction was not possible.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2016	1	0	1

FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

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

FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The data for one LEIS demonstrated continued improvement, but remained below the required 100% compliance level. This LEIS was provided additional TA and was required to develop additional CAP activities. Check-in calls were conducted between MDE and the LEIS coordinator periodically. Data submissions were reviewed to monitor compliance level.

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

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

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

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

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

8A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8A - OSEP Response

8A - Required Actions

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;

B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and

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

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8B - Indicator Data

Historical Data

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

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

YES

If no, please explain.

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
3,814	3,814	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of parents who opted out

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

0

Describe the method used to collect these data

N/A

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

NO

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

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

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

Full reporting period - July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019

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

Data from full reporting period are included.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In Michigan, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) is the State Education Agency (SEA) with intermediate school districts (ISDs) acting as local lead agencies. Given that Michigan is a birth mandate state (the term used is Michigan Mandatory Special Education (MMSE)) and the Part C local lead agency is the ISD, notification from Part C to the SEA and local education agency (LEA) is internal and takes place as the child is identified as eligible for MMSE at any time from birth to age three. Michigan defines potentially eligible for Part B preschool services as any child found eligible and receiving MMSE prior to two years, nine months while receiving services under Part C. Any toddler potentially eligible for Part B preschool services is transitioned 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 individualized education program team meeting at a mutually agreed upon time and place." Michigan Special Education Rule R 340.1721c. As specified in the Transition Intra-agency Agreement, each resident LEA (or its designee) will act on behalf of the SEA for the receipt of SEA notifications regarding a toddler exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B section 619. Therefore, the SEA and LEAs are notified of 100% of children potentially eligible for Part B.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

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

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

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

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

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

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

8B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8B - OSEP Response

8B - Required Actions

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;

B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and

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

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8C - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	84.40%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.68%	99.29%	94.31%	96.23%	96.99%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

If no, please explain.

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
3,476	3,814	96.99%	100%	98.52%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

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

35

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

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

247

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

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

Full reporting period - July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019

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

Data from full reporting period are included.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data were collected through the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS). All local early intervention systems (LEISs) submitted data regarding all children served to the state database at three designated points during the program year (July 1, 2018 - June 30, 2019). Data from the three collections were aggregated to provide data from the full reporting period.

Data reported for this indicator reflect that a total of 3,814 records included toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services for whom a transition conference was required to be conducted. Parents of 35 of these children did not provide approval for a transition conference. This number was subtracted from the 3,814 toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services and the resulting 3,779 was used as the denominator for calculation of Indicator 8c data. Data reported for this indicator reflect that 3,476 of the records documented timely transition conferences. Two hundred forty-seven additional records contained documentation that the delay to the completion of a transition conference was attributable to exceptional family circumstances. The number of records with documented exceptional family circumstances (247) was added to the timely records (3,476) resulting in a total of 3,723 records. This number was used as the numerator for the calculation. The resulting percentage of compliance is 98.52%.

$$(3,476+247)/(3,814-35)=.9852$$

Both the numerator and the denominator include 247 children for whom the transition conference was not timely, but whose file contained documentation that the delay was attributable to exceptional family circumstances. 98.52% compliance falls below the target of 100% compliance for this indicator. These data reflect an increased level of compliance for this indicator from the 96.99% compliance level reported in the FFY 2017 APR.

Thirty-two of 56 LEISs reported delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances for 247 children. Documented reasons for these delays include sickness or hospitalization of child or family members, multiple unsuccessful attempts to contact family to set appointment, meeting cancellations or family not being home at scheduled appointment times, meetings being rescheduled to accommodate family schedules, family moved, and other child or parent reasons.

Nine of 56 LEISs reported delays that were not attributable to exceptional family circumstances for a total of 56 children. Reasons for these delays include provider availability, personnel lack of training/knowledge, failure to report timeliness of transition conferences, or other provider reasons.

Two of the nine LEISs with delays that were not attributable to exceptional family circumstances were issued Findings of noncompliance and required to develop Corrective Action Plans (CAPs) during FFY 2019 based on this FFY 2018 data. The remaining seven of the nine LEISs were not issued new Findings, as they had open Findings and CAPs for Indicator 8c or a review of more recent data during verification and closeout of previously issued Findings and CAPs for Indicator 8c indicated 100% compliance.

Findings resulting from FFY 2018 data are based on the full reporting period; therefore, Findings based on FFY 2018 data were issued in FFY 2019.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Five LEISs were issued a Finding of noncompliance related to Indicator 8c in FFY 2017 based on a review of data submitted within MSDS.

Each LEIS developed a CAP in the electronic monitoring system that detailed strategies that the LEIS 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. Progress reports required the LEIS to conduct file reviews.

When CAP activities had been completed and progress reports indicated compliance, MDE conducted verification activities. MDE reviewed the most recent data submitted to MSDS to determine whether the LEIS had achieved 100% compliance. Records for all five LEISs were found to be in compliance resulting in a 100% compliance level within one year of notification of the noncompliance.

Documentation was also collected from the LEIS and state technical assistance (TA) providers to demonstrate that all CAP activities had been completed.

The LEIS were notified of the verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter closing the CAP.

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

For some of the children, a transition conference with all required participants was conducted but not at least 90 days prior to the child's third birthday. For these children, the LEIS was required to provide documentation that a transition conference with all required participants was indeed conducted. No further child level correction is possible because timeliness cannot be corrected.

The other impacted children were no longer under the jurisdiction of the local early intervention system. Child level correction was not possible.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2016	2	2	0

FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The data for the two LEISs with an open Finding issued during FFY 2016 demonstrated continued improvement but remained below the required 100% compliance level at the time the FFY 2017 SPP/APR was submitted. These LEISs were provided additional TA and were required to develop additional CAP activities. Check-in calls were conducted between MDE, the LEIS coordinators, and the assigned TA providers at regular intervals. For one of the LEISs, onsite TA was provided by MDE Consultants.

Data submissions were reviewed to monitor compliance level. When CAP activities had been completed and local data indicated compliance, MDE conducted verification activities. MDE reviewed the most recent data submitted to MSDS to determine whether each LEIS had achieved 100% compliance. All records for the LEISs during the selected time period were found to be in compliance resulting in a 100% compliance level. Documentation was also collected from the LEISs and from the state TA providers to demonstrate that all CAP activities had been completed. The LEISs were notified of the verification of correction of noncompliance through formal letters closing the CAPs.

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

For some of the children, a transition conference with all required participants was conducted but not at least 90 days prior to the child's third birthday. For these children, the LEIS was required to provide documentation that a transition conference with all required participants was indeed conducted. No further child level correction is possible because timeliness cannot be corrected.

The other impacted children were no longer under the jurisdiction of the local early intervention system. Child level correction was not possible.

FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

8C - Prior FFY Required Actions
None
Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8C - OSEP Response

8C - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Select yes to use target ranges.

Target Range not used

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

NO

Provide an explanation below.

Prepopulated Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Michigan Part C collaborates extensively with the MICC, the Governor-appointed advisory council. The MICC includes multiple stakeholders from various perspectives around the state. Issues are addressed through various ad hoc and standing committees. The Executive and Parent Involvement committees provide significant advice to the lead agency. When targets need to be established or revised, these committees, along with statewide contractors, review data and make recommendations for the targets. After several data review meetings, target recommendations were presented to the MICC at the November 2014 meeting. Each November the MICC reviews current data in comparison to the previously set targets. At the November 2018 meeting, the MICC recommended the Results indicator targets remain the same through FFY 2019. They also recommended the formation of a Data Ad Hoc Committee to advise MDE around target setting through FFY 2024.

Historical Data

Baseline					
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target>=					
Data	0.00%	0.00%			

Targets

FFY	**2018**	**2019**
Target>=		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

Targets

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

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

9 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2018. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

10 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

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

NO

Provide an explanation below

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	2
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	1
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	1

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Michigan Part C collaborates extensively with the MICC, the Governor-appointed advisory council. The MICC includes multiple stakeholders from various perspectives around the state. Issues are addressed through various ad hoc and standing committees. The Executive and Parent Involvement committees provide significant advice to the lead agency. When targets need to be established or revised, these committees, along with statewide contractors, review data and make recommendations for the targets. After several data review meetings, target recommendations were presented to the MICC at the November 2014 meeting. Each November the MICC reviews current data in comparison to the previously set targets. At the November 2018 meeting, the MICC recommended the Results indicator targets remain the same through FFY 2019. They also recommended the formation of a Data Ad Hoc Committee to advise MDE around target setting through FFY 2024.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	0.00%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target>=					
Data	0.00%	0.00%			

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1	1	2			100.00%	N/A	N/A

Targets

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

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

10 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2018. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

10 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role

Designated Lead Agency Director

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

Name:

Kevin Walters

Title:

Departmental Manager

Email:

waltersk5@michigan.gov

Phone:

517-335-0543

Submitted on:

04/24/20 1:31:42 PM