



Minnesota Part C Annual Performance Report

Fiscal Year 2013

Report

To the

Legislature

As required by

Minnesota Statutes,

section 125A.28

COMMISSIONER:

Brenda Cassellius, Ed. D.

Part C Annual Performance Report

April 2015

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:

Lisa Backer

Early Learning Services

651-582-8473

Lisa.backer@state.mn.us

Federal Fiscal Year 2013

Report to the Legislature

As required by

Minnesota

Statutes

125A.28

Cost of Report Preparation

The total cost for the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) to prepare this report was approximately \$420. Most of these costs involved staff time in analyzing data from surveys and preparing the written report. Incidental costs include paper, copying, and other office supplies. The Minnesota Department of Education is required to collect and analyze this data and describe our performance on selected indicators under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Estimated costs are provided in accordance with Minnesota Statutes 2011, section 3.197, which requires that at the beginning of a report to the Legislature, the cost of preparing the report must be provided.

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/ Annual Performance Report (APR)

General Supervision System:

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

The Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) administers a comprehensive system of general supervision including special education program and fiscal compliance monitoring, special education complaints, due process hearings and alternative dispute resolution options for parents, districts and other stakeholders in the special education and early intervention systems.

Program monitoring provides general supervision and oversight of special education and early intervention programs using the Minnesota Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (MNCIMP). MNCIMP is the vehicle for MDE's Division of Compliance and Assistance program monitoring unit to ensure a free appropriate public education (FAPE) is available for children with disabilities beginning at birth.

Each special education administrative unit (SEAU) is monitored for compliance through MDE's MNCIMP web-based data system which gathers data from early intervention records reviewed. Compliance monitoring takes place on a five-year cycle. In year one of the cycle, the SEAU conducts a self-review of records. A computer-generated sample is used to select the records to be reviewed from the most recent SEAU enrollment data chosen to accurately represent the SEAU as a whole. Selection is based on a stratified random sampling with consideration given to race/ethnicity, age, gender and primary disability. During the record review process, the most current Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) and corresponding due process documentation are reviewed for compliance with legal standards. In year two, the SEAU must demonstrate correction of any noncompliance identified in the self-review consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02.

In year three of the cycle, MDE conducts an onsite review of the SEAU including a review of early intervention records (following the same process for record selection as used in year one). Stakeholder input is gathered from early intervention service providers, parents and administrators. Data gathered from the various stakeholders helps to determine compliance within the district as well as identify areas of needed technical assistance.

In year four of the cycle, the SEAU must demonstrate correction of noncompliance identified during the MDE review and implement any corrective action, again consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. The fifth year of the cycle is used to verify results of the implemented corrective action plan. In any given year, data is collected through the self-review of records for 20 percent of the local programs in Minnesota.

Fiscal monitors from MDE's Fiscal Monitoring Team work to ensure that Part C funds are only used to serve eligible children and are administered under appropriate internal controls in the SEAU. Fiscal monitoring and program monitoring teams follow the same five year schedule with the exception that there is no self review process in fiscal monitoring. Annually, a risk assessment is completed in order to determine if an SEAU will receive an onsite review or one of two types of desk reviews. Once the SEAUs have been stratified into their appropriate risk category, the fiscal monitors utilize the Electronic Data Reporting System (EDRS) and the Minnesota Automated Reporting Student System (MARSS) to pick samples related to time and effort, procurement, and transportation. Additionally, information is requested from the SEAUs for inventory management. Each of the three levels of review request additional samples, more documentation, and monitor additional details of the data as the SEAU progresses higher in risk.

Corrective action by the local program as needed takes place in the year following a fiscal monitoring. Corrective action may include documenting processes, changing documents so they contain appropriate data, or making corrections within the EDRS or MARSS systems so data entered is accurate. MDE also reserves the right to reclaim funds should it be deemed funds were used for ineligible purposes.

Finally, the fiscal monitoring team receives fiscally based complaints and conducts investigations as necessary. When complaints come in to the agency, the investigation is led by the supervisor of this group but is also assigned to a monitor to assist. A complaint can be filed about any entity that provides publicly funded intervention services directly to families and children with disabilities that has violated a state or federal special education law or rule. Before filing a complaint, MDE encourages parents or other persons to first contact the school district's special education director, who may be able to help resolve the issue.

Once a fiscal investigation is opened, the entity is notified and provided a short timeline to provide requested documentation based on the nature of the complaint. Interviews with staff may be conducted, if necessary, and an onsite visit may occur. If the LEA is found to be in violation and a corrective action is deemed necessary, a corrective action plan is developed and the responsible education agencies must complete the corrective action within the specified timeframe. Through active follow-up, MDE ensures that corrective action plans are appropriately implemented and individual correction occurs within one year.

As noted, MDE administers a comprehensive dispute resolution system for the state. Minnesota Special Education Mediation Service (MNSEMS) provides conflict resolution assistance for students, schools, parents and agencies. Parents and program staff can use mediation or facilitated IFSP meeting(s) to address issues of conflict. During the summer of 2014, MDE's Special Education ADR Services conducted a continuous improvement process involving internal and external stakeholders, examined its procedures, and made changes to improve ADR's efficiency and effectiveness. Some changes included submission of requests online, faster online scheduling, automated emails, and the development of a vision of success for parents, older students, and educators.

Parents and districts are entitled to an impartial due process hearing to resolve disputes over identification, evaluation, education placement, or provision of a free appropriate public education to an infant, toddler or student with a disability. Parents and districts are encouraged to use mediation, conciliation or some other mutually agreed upon alternative before proceeding to a hearing. Information about the hearing system is available on the MDE website including a Hearing Request form, information on free or low-cost legal resources and Minnesota's procedural safeguards notice. While the majority of due process hearing requests are settled or resolved without a hearing, MDE continues to work with the Office of Administrative hearings, who conducts the hearings, districts, and parent advocates to educate parents and districts on their rights and responsibilities regarding due process hearing resolution sessions. Through these efforts, district participation in documenting the occurrence of the resolution sessions has increased by 100 percent. In addition, MDE is obtaining more accurate data regarding when the sessions are held and the results of the resolution session.

The special education complaint system is designed to ensure that all children with disabilities, including infants and toddlers, are provided a free appropriate public education. A complaint can be filed about any entity that provides publicly funded intervention services directly to families and children with disabilities that has violated a state or federal special education law or rule. Before filing a complaint, MDE encourages parents or other persons to first contact the school district's special education director, who may be able to help resolve the issue. Sample complaint forms for use by parents, other entities or private school stakeholders are available on the MDE website.

When MDE receives a complaint, an investigator is assigned who reviews the written complaint to determine the issues to be investigated. The individual or entity that filed the complaint is contacted and the issues, claims and facts are discussed. MDE has 60 calendar days to fully investigate and resolve the complaint from

the date the complaint is received in writing. If the LEA is found to be in violation and a corrective action is deemed necessary, a corrective action plan is developed and the responsible education agencies must complete the corrective action within the specified timeframe. Through active follow-up, MDE ensures that corrective action plans are appropriately implemented and individual correction occurs within one year.

Compliance and Assistance staff collaborates with other departmental divisions regarding the provision of early intervention and special education services.

Technical Assistance System:

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

The Early Childhood Special Education Team at MDE believes their role is to support local programs to "do it right and do it well" so that infants, toddlers and young children with disabilities and their families experience positive outcomes. "Doing it right" refers to those aspects of the work where there is a generally agreed upon right way and wrong way. "Doing it well" refers to efforts to achieve high levels of quality including the use of evidence-based practices. Our technical assistance (TA) efforts are our efforts to help programs do it right.

MDE uses a variety of mechanisms to provide technical assistance to leaders and providers within early childhood special education programs, which are responsible to deliver early intervention services. Our website is a constant source of information for families, administrators and direct service providers. MDE hosts two face-to-face opportunities annually to provide technical assistance to local program leaders. Each fall, a three day leadership conference is held in partnership with the Minnesota Division for Early Childhood of the Council for Exceptional Children. A one-day leadership forum is held each spring. Leaders from greater Minnesota have the option to participate in the forum virtually. A monthly call is held for program leaders focused almost exclusively on technical assistance. The call takes place the first Wednesday of each month at 1 p.m. which coincides with our states civil defense drills. Our local leaders know "if the siren is blowing they should be on the call". Members of the ECSE team provide individualized TA over the phone or on-site as needed or requested by a local program. MDE has established a team email box mde.ecse@state.mn.us to make it easier for local programs to consistently receive a timely, high quality answer to their technical questions. Kara Tempel, our Part C Coordinator, triages all messages to this mailbox, forwarding each message to the team member with the deepest knowledge in the needed subject.

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.

Strengthening our professional development system has been a team priority for the past seven years. During that time we have benefited considerably from participation in several important federal initiatives.

1. National Professional Development Center on Inclusion (NPDCI): Minnesota was one of four states selected to work with experts from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. This opportunity helped us establish a cross-sector state leadership team, create regional cross-sector professional development councils and launch regionalized professional development focused on selected evidence-based practices.
2. Technical Assistance Center on Social Emotional Intervention (TACSEI): Minnesota was one of four states selected to be supported to implement the practices of the pyramid model. We started with three demonstration sites and are now implementing in 53 local programs.

3. State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP): Minnesota was one of six states selected to participate in the initial cohort. Karen Blase has provided the ECSE team with considerable guidance and support in refining and refocusing our professional development system. The frameworks of active implementation are foundational to our enhanced professional development system.
4. Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center: Minnesota was the first state selected to receive targeted technical assistance to implement the revised Recommended Practices developed by the Division of Early Childhood of the Council for Exceptional Children. Commonly referred to as DEC's Recommended Practices, this work is focused on those practices that support child and family engagement in intervention.

Our professional development system is now referred to as the Centers of Excellence for Young Children with Disabilities (CoE). The stated vision of the CoE is that early childhood professionals will have the knowledge, skills and supports necessary to be effective in their respective roles in order to increase the probability that young children with disabilities and their families achieve positive outcomes. The CoE includes these structural components:

- Professional Development Facilitators located within each region of the state. The 10.0 FTE of individuals in this role actively partner with local program leaders to identify opportunities to improve quality and serve as the external coach to those programs implementing one of the three evidence-based usable interventions formally promoted through the CoE.
- State Leadership Team of cross-sector state agency personnel, higher education faculty, parents, and other stakeholders in the system.
- Consistent use of the frameworks of active implementation.
- Three usable interventions that are evidence-informed. These include the Pyramid Model (TACSEI), Family-guided Routines-based Intervention (FGRBI), and the Classroom Engagement Model.

Stakeholder Involvement:

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

A workgroup was convened to review data and develop preliminary targets. That workgroup was comprised of volunteer members of Minnesota's Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) and state agency staff from the Minnesota Departments of Health and Education. That group reviewed historical performance and target data for each indicator and discussed past contextual factors that helped or hindered the state's effort to meet or exceed each target. The group also identified factors that might similarly help or hinder the state's efforts to make progress from baseline for each indicator. From those discussions, preliminary targets were set for each indicator for each year included within the State Performance Plan (SPP). Preliminary targets were shared with local program leaders during a monthly Leadership Call and with the ICC during the quarterly meeting of the ICC. Each target was finalized through a vote of the ICC during its quarterly meeting on January 8, 2015.

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the state reported to the public on the FFY 2012 performance of each LEA 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 2012 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b) (1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the state's SPP, including any revision if the state has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2012 APR in 2014, is available.

MDE makes an annual determination on the performance of each Special Education Administrative Unit (SEAU) against specific criteria. MDE reviews all SEAU performance against selected targets in the Annual Performance Report (APR) and determines whether each SEAU met the requirements of Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

MDE publicly reports the performance of each SEAU by member district in its Data Center website under the Special Education District Profiles section. Performance on Part C indicators 1-8 are displayed on a data sheet that includes the program performance, the state rate and the state target. These district data profiles can be found at the link immediately below.

<http://w20.education.state.mn.us/MDEAnalytics/Data.jsp>

A complete copy of Minnesota's SPP and current APR are located on MDE's website on the landing page for the Governor's Interagency Coordinating Council.

<http://education.state.mn.us/MDE/Welcome/AdvBCT/ICC/index.html>

Indicator 1: Timely provision of services

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	91.00%	98.80%	98.00%	99.40%	98.80%	98.00%	99.75%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	5,162	258

Explanation of Alternate Data

Data for this indicator is taken from state monitoring and not the Child Count/Educational Environment Data. In FFY 2013, state monitoring included a review of 258 Part C records of infants and toddlers with IFSPs for compliance. See explanation below for details on method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage

258	258	100%	100%	100%	Met Target	No Slippage
-----	-----	------	------	------	------------	-------------

* FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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): 0

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

State monitoring

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

Data for this indicator has been collected through MDE’s Minnesota Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (MNCIMP) Web-based data system. The MNCIMP Web-based data system is used in part for gathering data from record reviews completed as part of compliance monitoring. Compliance monitoring of Early Intervention (EI) programs occurs through the monitoring of the Local Education Agencies (LEAs) through special education administrative units (SEAUs) scheduled on a five-year cycle. In year one of the cycle, the LEA conducts a self-review of records. In year two, the LEA must demonstrate correction of any noncompliance identified in the self-review consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. In year three, MDE conducts an onsite review of the LEA including a review of student records, facilities and the LEA’s Total Special Education System (TSES). In year four of the cycle, the LEA must demonstrate correction of noncompliance identified during the MDE review and implement any corrective action, again consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. The fifth year of the cycle is used to verify results of the implemented corrective action plan. In any given year, data is collected through the self-review of records for 20 percent of the LEAs in Minnesota.

As part of the record review, a computer-generated sample is used to determine the student records to be reviewed. Records are selected from the most recent SEAU enrollment data and are chosen in order to be accurately representative of the SEAU as a whole. Selection is based on a stratified random sampling with consideration given to race/ethnicity, age, gender, and primary disability of the student. During the record review, the most current Evaluation Report (ER), Individualized Education Program (IEP) or Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) and corresponding due process documentation are monitored to determine that legal standards are met.

Data for this indicator are gathered from examining records of children receiving Part C services and determining whether the services were provided in a timely manner. The FFY 2013 data are based on MDE reviews and LEA self-review of 35 SEAUs, comprised of 80 individual districts.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table:

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR: None

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected: None

Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected: None

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Historical Data and Targets

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)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		90.00%	91.00%	92.00%	92.50%	96.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Data	90.30%	92.30%	93.80%	94.50%	95.50%	95.35%	95.90%	96.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

A workgroup was convened to review data and develop preliminary targets. That workgroup was comprised of volunteer members of Minnesota's Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) and state agency staff from the Minnesota Departments of Health and Education. That group reviewed historical performance and target data for each indicator and discussed past contextual factors that helped or hindered the state's effort to meet or exceed each target. The group also identified factors that might similarly help or hinder the state's efforts to make progress from baseline for each indicator. From those discussions, preliminary targets were set for each indicator for each year included within the State Performance Plan (SPP). Preliminary targets were shared with local program leaders during a monthly Leadership Call and with the ICC during the quarterly meeting of the ICC. Each target was finalized through a vote of the ICC.

Discussion specific to this indicator focused on the desire to maintain a robust target at 95 percent throughout the years covered by the SPP while acknowledging the need for flexibility among members of Individual Family Service Plan teams to identify times when it is justifiable to provide early intervention services in an environment that is not a natural environment.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	4,987	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	5,162	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
4,987	5,162	96.00%	95.00%	96.61%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Minnesota is consistently strong in statewide efforts to serve infants and toddlers with disabilities in natural environments. Each child's home is the setting in which most early intervention services are delivered. In those instances when early intervention services are delivered in an environment that is not considered a natural environment the team appropriately justifies the alternative placement based on the child's age or the nature of the child's disability.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table:

None

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Historical Data and Targets

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)

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A1	2013 2008	Target ≥					66.00%	64.00%	65.00%	66.00%
		Data				64.10%	63.80%	63.00%	58.80%	57.70%
A2	2013 2008	Target ≥					41.00%	42.00%	42.50%	43.00%
		Data				40.40%	42.20%	44.00%	48.30%	49.50%
B1	2013 2008	Target ≥					70.00%	66.00%	67.00%	68.00%
		Data				68.20%	65.10%	65.00%	62.50%	61.20%
B2	2013 2008	Target ≥					42.00%	43.00%	43.50%	44.00%
		Data				40.70%	42.20%	41.00%	43.40%	45.10%
C1	2013 2008	Target ≥					70.00%	68.00%	69.00%	70.00%
		Data				68.00%	67.30%	66.00%	64.00%	62.70%
C2	2013 2008	Target ≥					44.00%	45.00%	45.50%	46.00%
		Data				42.70%	44.20%	46.00%	49.20%	49.70%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

Explanation of Changes

Minnesota proposes to re-establish the baselines for each outcome and summary statement. The decision to reset these baselines is grounded in two important lessons learned over the past eight years of collecting and analyzing child outcome data. First, as we have worked to improve the accuracy of each rating, the impact on Summary Statement 1 for each outcome has been consistently negative. Improved data quality has reduced the calculated percent of children identified as making greater than expected progress. We are working to turn the curve on this steady decline. Efforts have similarly impacted Summary Statement 2 though less dramatically. As we now have much greater faith in the quality of our child outcome data, we considered it prudent to reestablish our performance baseline.

Targets from FFY 2012 were not automatically displayed and so were manually added to mirror those included in Minnesota's previous Part C SPP.

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	54.13%	54.20%	54.30%	54.40%	54.50%	54.60%
Target A2 ≥	49.82%	50.00%	51.00%	52.00%	53.00%	54.00%
Target B1 ≥	60.20%	60.30%	60.40%	60.50%	60.60%	60.70%
Target B2 ≥	44.11%	44.50%	45.00%	45.50%	46.50%	47.50%
Target C1 ≥	61.91%	62.00%	62.10%	62.20%	62.30%	62.40%
Target C2 ≥	51.26%	51.50%	52.00%	53.00%	54.00%	55.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

A workgroup was convened to review data and develop preliminary targets. That workgroup was comprised of volunteer members of Minnesota's Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) and state agency staff from the Minnesota Departments of Health and Education. That group reviewed historical performance and target data for each indicator and discussed past contextual factors that helped or hindered the state's effort to meet or exceed each target. The group also identified factors that might similarly help or hinder the state's efforts to make progress from baseline for each indicator. From those discussions, preliminary targets were set for each indicator for each year included within the State Performance Plan (SPP). Preliminary targets were shared with local program leaders during a monthly Leadership Call and with the ICC during the quarterly meeting of the ICC. Each target was finalized through a vote of the ICC.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed: 2,768

Does 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)?

No

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

	Number of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	31
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	875

c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	483
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	586
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	793

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 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 $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	1,069	1,975	57.70 %	54.13 %	54.13 %	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 $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	1,379	2,768	49.50%	49.82%	49.82%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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

	Number of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	30
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	877
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	640
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	732
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	489

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 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 $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	1,372	2,279	61.20%	60.20%	60.20%	Met Target	No Slippage

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	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 $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	1,221	2,768	45.10%	44.11%	44.11%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	26
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	777
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	546
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	759
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	660

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 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 $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	1,305	2,108	62.70%	61.91%	61.91%	Met 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 $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	1,419	2,768	49.70%	51.26%	51.26%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? Yes

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table:

The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 APR.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Child Outcome	2012 Performance	2012 Target	2013 Performance	2013 Target	Slippage from 2012 Performance?	Met Prior Year Target?
A1	57.7%	66%	54.13%	None*	Yes	No
A2	49.5%	43%	49.82%	None*	No	No
B1	61.2%	68%	60.2%	None*	Yes	No
B2	45.1%	44%	44.11	None*	Yes	Yes
C1	62.7%	70%	61.91	None*	Yes	No
C2	49.7%	46%	51.26	None*	No	Yes

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Historical Data and Targets

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)

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2013 2006	Target ≥				85.00%	90.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
		Data		75.00%	76.60%	81.00%	82.00%	84.00%	82.70%	86.10%
B	2013 2006	Target ≥				86.00%	88.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%
		Data		87.00%	83.10%	87.00%	89.00%	90.00%	88.20%	89.70%
C	2013 2006	Target ≥				93.00%	96.00%	100%	92.00%	92.00%
		Data		90.00%	86.70%	90.00%	92.00%	87.00%	86.40%	86.60%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

Explanation of Changes

Minnesota proposes to reset baselines to FFY 2013 performance rates. This action creates a fresh start for the state and for local programs. When baseline and targets were initially established the state dramatically underestimated the effort needed to improve statewide data. Annual targets quickly rose above annual performance. Targets became unattainable and therefore meaningless. We hope to re-energize and re-engage local programs in these targets through this action.

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	89.00%	90.00%	90.30%	90.60%	91.00%	91.50%
Target B ≥	93.00%	93.20%	93.40%	93.60%	93.80%	94.00%
Target C ≥	90.00%	90.30%	90.60%	90.90%	91.20%	91.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

A workgroup was convened to review data and develop preliminary targets. That workgroup was comprised of volunteer members of Minnesota's Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) and state agency staff from the Minnesota Departments of Health and Education. That group reviewed historical performance and target data for each indicator and discussed past contextual factors that helped or hindered the state's effort to meet or exceed each target. The group also identified factors that might similarly help or hinder the state's efforts to make progress from baseline for each indicator. From those discussions, preliminary targets were set for each indicator for each year included within the State Performance Plan (SPP). Preliminary targets were shared with local program leaders during a monthly Leadership Call and with the ICC during the quarterly meeting of the ICC. Each target was finalized through a vote of the ICC.

Discussion specific to this indicator focused on recent efforts to help parents better understand their rights and shared belief in the importance of helping parents to help their children develop and learn.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent families participating in Part C	863
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention	770
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the	863
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	799
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	863
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	775
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the	863

* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

	FFY 2012	FFY 2013	FFY 2013	Status	Slippage
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	86.10%	89.00%	89.22%	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	89.70%	93.00%	92.58%	Did Not Meet 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	86.60%	90.00%	89.80%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

Minnesota does not use sampling in collecting data or reporting this indicator. The pool of potential respondents exactly matches the demographics of families served by and exiting Part C. All families who have participated in early intervention services for six months or more are provided the Family Outcome Survey at the time of transition to Part B or to other community supports and services. The Family Outcome Survey has

been translated into thirteen languages to limit barriers attributable to a family's home primary language being a language other than English. The Minnesota Department of Education has provided local programs with procedures to use to obtain survey data from families who do not read or whose primary language is not a written language.

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State

No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table: None

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Historical Data and Targets

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)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		0.55%	0.60%	0.80%	0.85%	0.85%	0.88%	0.90%
Data	0.46%	0.63%	0.62%	0.79%	0.74%	0.91%	0.87%	0.98%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

A workgroup was convened to review data and develop preliminary targets. That workgroup was comprised of volunteer members of Minnesota's Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) and state agency staff from the Minnesota Departments of Health and Education. That group reviewed historical performance and target data for each indicator and discussed past contextual factors that helped or hindered the state's effort to meet or exceed each target. The group also identified factors that might similarly help or hinder the state's efforts to make progress from baseline for each indicator. From those discussions, preliminary targets were set for each indicator for each year included within the State Performance Plan (SPP). Preliminary targets were shared with local program leaders during a monthly Leadership Call and with the ICC during the quarterly meeting of the ICC. Each target was finalized through a vote of the ICC.

Discussion specific to this indicator focused on the continued impact of Minnesota's heightened efforts to inform all primary referral sources through the Help Me Grow public awareness campaign, changes made to a state data system which mandates referrals from child protective services and enhanced convenience for primary referral sources of the automated referral conduit, implemented during June of 2014. We also discussed the limitations on eligibility imposed by our criteria. Specifically, at what point will we have reached our maximum eligibility rate?

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	667	

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013	12/16/2014	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	68,678	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
667	68,678	0.98%	0.98%	0.97%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In FFY 13 Minnesota identified and served 0.97% of infants through Part C. This is lower than the national rate of 1.11%. Minnesota has historically performed lower than the country as a whole do to the eligibility parameters established by our definition of developmental delay.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table: None

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Historical Data and Targets

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)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		1.70%	1.90%	2.10%	2.25%	2.30%	2.35%	2.40%
Data	1.56%	1.70%	1.83%	2.10%	2.15%	2.37%	2.45%	2.44%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	2.50%	2.53%	2.60%	2.68%	2.75%	2.82%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

A workgroup was convened to review data and develop preliminary targets. That workgroup was comprised of volunteer members of Minnesota's Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) and state agency staff from the Minnesota Departments of Health and Education. That group reviewed historical performance and target data for each indicator and discussed past contextual factors that helped or hindered the state's effort to meet or exceed each target. The group also identified factors that might similarly help or hinder the state's efforts to make progress from baseline for each indicator. From those discussions, preliminary targets were set for each indicator for each year included within the State Performance Plan (SPP). Preliminary targets were shared with local program leaders during a monthly Leadership Call and with the ICC during the quarterly meeting of the ICC. Each target was finalized through a vote of the ICC.

Discussion specific to this indicator focused on the continued impact of Minnesota's heightened efforts to inform all primary referral sources through the Help Me Grow public awareness campaign, changes made to a state data system which mandates referrals from child protective services and enhanced convenience for primary referral sources of the automated referral conduit, implemented during June of 2014.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 ChildCount/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	5,162	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates	12/16/2014	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	207,385	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
5,162	207,385	2.44%	2.50%	2.49%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In federal fiscal year 2013 Minnesota's identified and served 2.49% of the state's infants and toddlers under Part C. This is lower than the national rate of 2.82%. Minnesota has historically performed lower than the country as a whole due to the eligibility parameters established by the state's adopted criteria.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table: None

Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Historical Data and Targets

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)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	83.40%	86.30%	83.90%	83.40%	77.30%	90.70%	93.60%	91.10%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
209	233	91.10%	100%	97.66%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

* FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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)

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

State monitoring

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

Data for this indicator has been collected through MDE's Minnesota Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (MNCIMP) web-based data system. The MNCIMP web-based data system is used in part for gathering data from record reviews completed as part of compliance monitoring. Compliance monitoring of

Early Intervention (EI) programs occurs through the monitoring of the Local Education Agencies (LEAs) through special education administrative units (SEAUs) scheduled on a five-year cycle. In year one of the cycle, the SEAU conducts a self-review of records. In year two, the SEAU must demonstrate correction of any noncompliance identified in the self-review consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. In year three, MDE conducts an on-site review of the SEAU including a review of early intervention records, facilities, and the Total Special Education System (TSES). In year four of the cycle, the SEAU must demonstrate correction of noncompliance identified during the MDE review and implement any corrective action, again consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. The fifth year of the cycle is used to verify results of the implemented corrective action plan. In any given year, data is collected through the self-review of records for 20 percent of the SEAUs in Minnesota.

As part of the record review, a computer-generated sample is used to determine the student records to be reviewed. Records are selected from the most recent SEAU enrollment data and are chosen in order to be accurately representative of the SEAU as a whole. Selection is based on a stratified random sampling with consideration given to race/ethnicity, age, gender, and primary disability of the student. During the record review, the most current Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) and corresponding due process documentation are monitored to determine that legal standards are met.

Data for this indicator are gathered from examining records of children receiving Part C services and determining whether the services were provided in a timely manner. The FFY 2013 data are based on MDE reviews and LEA self-review of 35 SEAUs, comprised of 80 individual districts.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

Indicator 8: Early Childhood Transition

FFY 2013 Data

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)

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	123
Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	100

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Historical Data and Targets

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)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	80.40%	87.00%	91.00%	95.30%	99.00%	100%	93.00%	95.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
Indicator		Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	123	
Indicator		Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible	100	

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

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
122	123	95.00%	100%	99.19%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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): 0

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

State Monitoring

State Database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

Data for this indicator has been collected through MDE’s Minnesota Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (MNCIMP) web-based data system. The MNCIMP web-based data system is used in part for gathering data from record reviews completed as part of compliance monitoring. Compliance monitoring of Early Intervention (EI) programs occurs through the monitoring of the Local Education Agencies (LEAs) through special education administrative units (SEAUs) scheduled on a five-year cycle. In year one of the cycle, the SEAU conducts a self-review of records. In year two, the SEAU must demonstrate correction of any noncompliance identified in the self-review consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. In year three, MDE conducts an on-site review of the SEAU including a review of early intervention records, facilities, and the Total Special Education System (TSES). In year four of the cycle, the SEAU must demonstrate correction of noncompliance identified during the MDE review and implement any corrective action, again consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. The fifth year of the cycle is used to verify results of the implemented corrective action plan. In any given year, data is collected through the self-review of records for 20 percent of the SEAUs in Minnesota.

As part of the record review, a computer-generated sample is used to determine the student records to be reviewed. Records are selected from the most recent SEAU enrollment data and are chosen in order to be accurately representative of the SEAU as a whole. Selection is based on a stratified random sampling with consideration given to race/ethnicity, age, gender, and primary disability of the student. During the record review, the most current Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) and corresponding due process documentation are monitored to determine that legal standards are met.

Data for this indicator are gathered from examining records of children receiving Part C services and determining whether the services were provided in a timely manner. The FFY 2013 data are based on MDE reviews and LEA self-review of 35 SEAUs, comprised of 80 individual districts.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Historical Data and Targets

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)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2013 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
Indicator 8		Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	100	

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

Yes

No

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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
100	100	100%	100%	100%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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 when calculating the FFY 2013 Data): 0

Describe the method used to collect these data

MDE includes the following among the "statement of assurances" required to be signed annually by local Early Intervention Program administrators prior to receipt of Part C funds. This has been accepted by OSEP as a component of Minnesota's Part C Application.

"The Part C program must provide notification to the State Education Agency (SEA) and the appropriate Local Education Agency (LEA) no fewer than 90 days prior to the child's third birthday, for those children who are potentially eligible for Part B services. 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1)-(2). However, per MDE policy, this notification only needs to be provided to the LEA, who is acting as an agent of the SEA for this specific purpose, to satisfy the notification requirements."

Do you have a written opt-out policy? No

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Historical Data and Targets

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)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	30.35%	50.00%	59.00%	95.60%	92.00%	91.00%	99.00%	99.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2013 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/SPR Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
Indicator 8		Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	100	

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

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
98	100	99.00%	100%	98.00%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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 when calculating the FFY 2013 Data)	0
Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B)	0

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

- State Monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

Data for this indicator has been collected through MDE's Minnesota Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (MNCIMP) web-based data system. The MNCIMP web-based data system is used in part for gathering data from record reviews completed as part of compliance monitoring. Compliance monitoring of Early Intervention (EI) programs occurs through the monitoring of the Local Education Agencies (LEAs) through special education administrative units (SEAs) scheduled on a five-year cycle. In year one of the cycle, the SEA conducts a self-review of records. In year two, the SEA must demonstrate correction of any noncompliance identified in the self-review consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. In year three, MDE conducts an on-site review of the SEA including a review of early intervention records, facilities, and the Total Special Education System (TSES). In year four of the cycle, the SEA must demonstrate correction of noncompliance identified during the MDE review and implement any corrective action, again consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. The fifth year of the cycle is used to verify results of the implemented corrective action plan. In any given year, data is collected through the self-review of records for 20 percent of the SEAs in Minnesota.

As part of the record review, a computer-generated sample is used to determine the student records to be reviewed. Records are selected from the most recent SEA enrollment data and are chosen in order to be accurately representative of the SEA as a whole. Selection is based on a stratified random sampling with consideration given to race/ethnicity, age, gender, and primary disability of the student. During the record review, the most current Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) and corresponding due process documentation are monitored to determine that legal standards are met.

Data for this indicator are gathered from examining records of children receiving Part C services and determining whether the services were provided in a timely manner. The FFY 2013 data are based on MDE reviews and LEA self-review of 35 SEAs, comprised of 80 individual districts.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Historical Data and Targets

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).

Historical Data

Baseline Data:

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥								
Data								

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥						

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

3.1 Number of resolution sessions	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0				Incomplete Data	N/A

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Indicator 10: Mediation

Historical Data and Targets

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)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥			83.00%					
Data				100%				100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0	
EMAPS IDEA Part B	11/5/2014	2.1 Mediations held	0	