



EARLY SUPPORT FOR INFANTS AND TODDLERS: 2018-2019 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT



Washington State Department of
CHILDREN, YOUTH & FAMILIES

Executive Summary:

The Department of Children, Youth, and Families (DCYF) is a new cabinet level agency focused on the well-being of children. Our vision is to ensure that "All Washington's children and youth grow up safe and healthy, thriving physically, emotionally, and academically, nurtured by family and community". (House Bill 1661)

DCYF serves as the State Lead Agency for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C program for Washington State. Within DCYF, the Part C programmatic home is the Early Support for Infants and Toddlers (ESIT) Program.

Historically the state funding (approximately \$92 million) for the provision of early intervention services has been appropriated through the Washington State Education Agency (SEA), Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), and funds flow directly to public school districts. Districts are currently required by RCW 28A.155.065 to provide, or contract, or both, for early intervention services in partnership with local Birth-to-Three lead agencies and Birth-to-Three providers. At the time of this submission, there is drafted, active legislation (HB 2787 and SB 6547) to transfer the state apportionment for the provision of early intervention services from OSPI to DCYF to align state funding with the State Lead Agency, which holds General Supervisory Authority. The drafted legislation also includes statutory changes to amend RCW 28A.155.065 to relieve school district from their obligation to provide or contract for early intervention services and transfer the duty to DCYF.

During Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2018, the ESIT program held contracts with twenty-four (24) Local Lead Agencies (LLAs) statewide in order to ensure that all families have equitable access to a locally coordinated system of early intervention services. As a result, 19,647 eligible infants, toddlers, and their families received early intervention services during the past year. The types of organizations that administered each local early intervention system included:

- 1 County Regional Health District
- 4 County Human Service Agencies
- 1 Combined Health and Human Services Agency;
- 14 Nonprofit Agencies; and
- 4 Educational Service Districts

To ensure services are coordinated and conform to IDEA Part C requirements, each LLA develops and maintains subcontracts or local interagency agreements and local plans with individual early intervention providers or providing organizations within their geographic service area.

This past year, the ESIT program met the following targets:

- Services in natural environments (Indicator C2)
- Child Find (Indicators C5 and C6)
- Early childhood transition with the development of timely IFSPs 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 (Indicator C8.A)
- Early childhood transition with timely notifications to the State Educational Agency (SEA) and the Local Educational Agency (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 (Indicator C8.B)

ESIT had no mediations that resulted in mediation agreements.

ESIT sustained the significant improvement gained in the last year for results of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped their family (Indicator 4):

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

Although ESIT did not meet target for Child Outcomes (Indicator 3), there was an increased percentage of performance for a majority of the outcomes including Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills for Summary Statement 1, which was a 2.32% increase from last year and for Summary Statement 2, which was a 1.86% increase from last year. These increases were achieved as a result of the State Systemic Improvement Plan efforts and activities.

General Supervision System:

The systems in place to ensure that IDEA Part C requirements are met.

[General Supervision System]

The Early Support for Infants and Toddlers (ESIT) program continues to direct its general supervision and monitoring efforts through the following:

- Aligning and integrating activities with the Annual Performance Report (APR);
- Meeting federal requirements for states to monitor implementation of IDEA, both APR indicators and related requirements; and
- Focusing on compliance and quality practices, especially those closely aligned with results for children and families; and Directing state technical assistance resources to those local lead agencies in greatest need.

[Monitoring Local Lead Agencies (LLAs) on APR Indicators]

ESIT Data Management System (DMS): All APR indicator data, with the exception of Indicator 4 - Family Outcomes, is retrieved from the DMS. The DMS creates an electronic Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) record that documents essential child and family information from initial contacts through transition. All child and family information must be entered into the DMS. This includes initial evaluation/assessment results, medical information, eligibility determination, and the child outcome summary (which incorporates a description of functional performance), family statement, individual child and family outcomes and services information. All this information is required to be entered into the DMS before an IFSP can be issued as completed.

Child level data is retrieved from IFSPs entered into the DMS and used for APR reporting. DMS business rules and calendar tools ensure either required information is entered into the system or a reason for not entering the information is supplied. When required information is not entered into the DMS in a timely manner, the system creates red alerts on the family resources coordinator's (FRC) calendar. Local lead agency (LLA) staff (i.e. FRCs, program managers, agency administrators) and ESIT staff monitor the calendar. Red alerts are reviewed and the ESIT staff provide technical assistance.

Results Indicators: APR Indicators 2, 5, and 6 results data is obtained from all IFSPs entered into the DMS on December 1 of the contract year as reported in 618 data submissions gathered throughout the Federal Fiscal Year. Indicator 4 data is collected from hard copy, electronic and phone surveys completed by families and submitted to ESIT annually.

Compliance Indicators: APR Indicators 1, 7, 8, 8A, 8B, and 8C compliance data is retrieved from all IFSPs over a three (3) month period. DMS data is reviewed and verified for accuracy.

Identification and Correction of Non-Compliance: ESIT staff review and analyze compliance data to assess the “reasons” for any noncompliance (delayed services). When necessary, ESIT staff request and obtain clarification regarding reasons for late services, IFSP meeting, transition plan, and transition notification or transition conference to determine the root cause of noncompliance. If late services were due to exceptional family circumstances, findings of noncompliance are not made. If late services were due to reasons other than exceptional family circumstances, child specific noncompliance is identified and findings are issued. If it was determined that the noncompliance was already corrected, a finding is still issued, but a corrective action plan is not required. Even though correction occurred (the service provided though late), ESIT staff still assesses the level of noncompliance, identifies the contributing factors, if any, and determines if the noncompliance was isolated or systemic.

Within three (3) months from when compliance-monitoring data is retrieved from the DMS, each LLA receives a written notice of findings of noncompliance and the need to make timely correction. Upon receipt of written notice, each LLA administrator is directed to begin implementing required improvement activities to ensure correction is made, as soon as possible, but no later than one year from notification. Once correction of findings of noncompliance is achieved, the LLA receives a written notice that correction of noncompliance was attained.

When required, corrective action plans (CAPs) outline the resources needed to be accessed and timelines to follow in order to achieve compliance and/or improve performance. CAPs are required of all LLAs that do not fully correct identified noncompliance by the time annual determinations are issued.

[Annual Determination Process]

ESIT makes an annual determination of LLA efforts in implementing the requirements and purposes of IDEA, Part C. Each LLA APR data is aggregated by ESIT for annual reporting purposes. This aggregated data is used by the federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) to make ESIT’s annual determination.

ESIT staff disaggregates and evaluates this data to make LLA annual determinations. LLA determination status is based on the following:

1. Compliance Data
 - Indicator 1 - timely services
 - Indicator 7 - timely evaluations and meeting the 45-day timeline
 - Indicator 8A - transition plan steps and services
 - Indicator 8C - transition conference
2. Timely correction of noncompliance
3. All Indicators must be timely, valid and reliable
4. Citizen’s complaints filed and/or due process hearing or mediations held

ESIT reports to the public the performance of each LLA, a review of each program’s performance against targets in the State’s SPP/APR within 120 days from when ESIT submits the APR to OSEP.

[Dispute Resolution Options]

The timely administrative resolution of complaints occurs through established mediation, complaint, and due

process hearing procedures. Monitoring the use of these dispute resolution options assists ESIT in identifying noncompliance and other systemic issues. Families are made aware of their dispute resolution options throughout their participation in the early intervention program. ESIT has a system in place to track and monitor complaint, mediation and due process dispute resolution activities. Parent identified issues are typically resolved through informal procedures rather than the formal dispute resolution options that are available to them.

[Biennial Local Team Self-Assessment Process]

Each LLA self-assessment team is required to complete the self-assessment biennially through a review of children's records. In addition, each LLA is now required to complete a portion of the Local Child Outcomes Measurement System Self-Assessment (LCOMS-SA). Each LLA submits a Local System Improvement Plan with a minimum of one improvement activity related to the local team self-assessment results and one activity related to the LCOMS-SA. The LLA implements improvement strategies throughout the following contract year.

The self-assessment tool and process is designed to gather data from each LLA on state selected data that is not available through the DMS. These data are used to substantiate compliance with IDEA and related requirements associated with each APR indicator, and to encourage the use of best practices associated with improved results for children and families.

[On-site Targeted Technical Assistance]

Targeted technical assistance is provided to individual LLAs, a selected group of LLAs, or statewide as needs are identified. Through the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), LLAs that are implementation sites receive targeted training and technical assistance as described in Indicator 11. Monitoring, complaints, mediation, and due process data may be used to identify and provide technical assistance. On-site targeted technical assistance is provided more frequently when an issue or set of issues that require focused attention has been identified. The technical assistance visit centers on the exploration of factors that might contribute to the present performance or system concern/issue. Information, resources, and supports are provided based on the contributing factors or identified concerns and issues.

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 Support for Infant and Toddlers (ESIT) program employs program consultants with Part C experience to provide technical assistance to local lead agency (LLA) contractors statewide. Technical assistance is provided through methods including, as needed; email and phone calls, quarterly calls, and on-site visits, depending on locally identified needs or concerns.

Regional LLA meetings occur quarterly in various eastern and western Washington locations. Meeting topics include; discussion and sharing regarding challenges, successes and evidence-based early intervention practices.

ESIT provides direction through practice guides and other written materials. Technical assistance is provided on a variety of topics through webinar recordings. State and national resources are accessed through electronic sources and websites. ESIT technical assistance materials and other publications may be accessed by going to

<https://www.dcyf.wa.gov/services/child-dev-support-providers/esit/training>.

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.

Through contracts with the Early Support for Infants and Toddlers (ESIT) program, local lead agencies (LLAs) are required to ensure all early intervention programs employ qualified personnel. This contract requirement pertains to employing service coordinators or family resources coordinators (FRCs). ESIT guidance on minimum education and state licensure/certification/registration requirements are posted on the ESIT website.

This guidance information is accessible by going to

https://www.dcyf.wa.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/esit/Qualified_Personnel_Guidelines.pdf.

The Office of Superintendent for Public Instruction and Department of Health license or certify most providers. ESIT provides a statewide training and registration system for FRCs. Maintaining current FRC registration status requires meeting annual training requirements.

ESIT offers three basic Part C online training modules, quarterly professional learning community (PLC) seminars, and various training opportunities on current topics throughout the year. Training occurs through webinars, conference calls or local onsite workshops. Two curricula, developed by and for parents explaining Part C and transition are posted on the website.

Training efforts are in place statewide and in local implementation sites as part of ESIT's State Systemic Improvement Plan.

ESIT is a major sponsor and active participant on the planning committee for the statewide Infant and Early Childhood Conference that occurs each year. This important conference draws professionals and interested stakeholders from across the state's many early childhood programs. State and national experts from diverse early childhood backgrounds continue to be key conference and workshop presenters. This conference continues to serve as the state's key early childhood professional development event.

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).

SICC Special Meeting -- Annual Performance Report (APR) Review

January 15, 2020, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) met to review the Washington State's Part C State Annual Performance Report. The SICC provided input and requested additional clarification. Some Indicators were discussed in more detail with SICC input integrated into indicator sections as appropriate. The SICC did not directly recommend changes to any targets that were previously set, rather referred a review of the targets to the Data Committee as part of its ongoing data analysis. The Data Committee intends to integrate a racial equity mindset into each of its work plan components throughout FFY 2019.

Target Setting Meetings –Local Stakeholder Involvement

Stakeholder meetings were convened in November 2014 to discuss APR target setting. A broad range of stakeholders participated including; early intervention service providers, agency administrators, local lead

agency (LLA) staff and school district staff. The group was given the task of reviewing data and making recommendations to ESIT on targets covering the next six years for Indicators 2, 3a,b,c, 4a,b,c, 5 and 6.

An overview of the indicators and parameters of target setting were presented. Participants were divided into small groups and given a data packet for reference in their discussions. The data packet showed state trends for each results indicator over the past several years. After discussion and analysis, individuals from the groups generated a recommendation for each target for the next six years. ESIT staff were present to answer any questions.

Results were compiled and the mean, median, and modes were calculated for each indicator for each year. The groups' input was consolidated into one set of indicators for each year and presented at a special APR review meeting of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) in January 2015.

January 15, 2020, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) met to reviewed all target setting for Indicators 2, 3a,b,c, 4a,b,c, 5 and 6 as a part of the annual performance review process. The Council did not directly recommend changes to any targets that were previously set, rather referred a review of the targets to the Data Committee as part of its ongoing data analysis.

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.

The Early Support for Infants and Toddlers Program made the following items available to the public on the program website at

<https://www.dcyf.wa.gov/practice/oiaa/reports>.

- Annual Performance Report (APR)
- Local Lead Agency APR Data
- Local Lead Agency Determination Status Reports
- 618 Data Tables

Information on how these reports could be accessed was emailed to our SICC, LLAs, and other stakeholders.

On June 18, 2019, the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) FFY 2019 Determination Letter notified the director of the Washington State Department of Children, Youth, and Families (DCYF), the State Lead Agency for Part C, that the Washington State Part C program met requirements of Part C of the IDEA.

Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 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	2005	87.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.08%	98.16%	96.57%	97.93%	96.90%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
4,306	4,545	96.90%	100%	97.34%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

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

118

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).

Washington State’s criteria for timely receipt of early intervention services requires the provider agency to conduct an initial evaluation and assessments and the initial IFSP within 45 days from the date the provider agency received the referral. The early interventions services listed on the initial IFSP must start within 30 days from the initial IFSP date or have a planned start date set in the future (beyond 30 days from the IFSP date). When a future planned start date is set, the actual service must start on or before that date.

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

State database

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

Data were collected from July 1, 2018 through September 30, 2018 and was obtained from all IFSPs entered into the ESIT Data Management System (DMS) during this period.

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

The three months of data collected from all IFSPs during this period contained the full range of variability exhibited by the population served by ESIT throughout the year. The data is from all programs across the state making it representative of the entire state.

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
131	131	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

The ESIT program verified that it corrected all findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02.

ESIT staff, Local Lead Agency (LLA) administrators, Family Resources Coordinators (FRCs), and providers used the ESIT Data Management System (DMS) IFSP Compliance Report to review data.

From the date the LLA received a finding letter for noncompliance, the LLA had one year to correct identified non-compliance for each indicator not meeting 100%. Each LLA reviewed compliance reports from the DMS to ensure data was entered accurately into the system and that the regulatory requirements regarding timely service provision were being met.

To verify that noncompliance was correctly addressing the regulatory requirements, each LLA reviewed and identified a minimum of two weeks of DMS data. If data demonstrated compliance for each indicator where findings were issued, compliance was considered achieved. The LLA then submitted the DMS data to ESIT staff for reverification. After ESIT staff verified the data submitted, (and verified correction of individual child noncompliance, ESIT staff sent a letter documenting that noncompliance was fully corrected.

If correction of non-compliance has not been verified within one-year of the findings, ESIT staff notifies the LLA that they must develop a CAP. During FFY17, no LLA met the criteria for needing a CAP.

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

ESIT staff verified correction of each individual incidence of non-compliance through the ESIT data management system (DMS). The DMS provides a start date and an actual start date for every new service initiated in an IFSP. If a service is late, the DMS requires the user to enter a reason for the delay.

Late Exceptional Family Circumstance (EFC): extraordinary events that prevent the family from participating in required events on time.

Late Other: events identified by the early intervention program or provider and not the family that prevent required events from being completed on time.

ESIT staff reviewed compliance reports from the DMS during the annual compliance monitoring period and subsequent intervals as needed to verify each individual instance of noncompliance is corrected unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the local lead agency, the family declined services, or the local lead agency was unable to make contact with the family.

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	48.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	92.25%	92.50%	92.75%	93.00%	93.25%
Data	94.06%	94.49%	95.34%	95.54%	96.21%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	93.50%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

SICC Special Meeting -- Annual Performance Report (APR) Review
January 15, 2020, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) met to review the Washington State's Part C State Annual Performance Report. The SICC provided input and requested additional clarification. Some Indicators were discussed in more detail with SICC input integrated into indicator sections as appropriate. The SICC did not directly recommend changes to any targets that were previously set, rather referred a review of the targets to the Data Committee as part of its ongoing data analysis. The Data Committee intends to integrate a racial equity mindset into each of its work plan components throughout FFY 2019.

Target Setting Meetings –Local Stakeholder Involvement

Stakeholder meetings were convened in November 2014 to discuss APR target setting. A broad range of stakeholders participated including; early intervention service providers, agency administrators, local lead agency (LLA) staff and school district staff. The group was given the task of reviewing data and making recommendations to ESIT on targets covering the next six years for Indicators 2, 3a,b,c, 4a,b,c, 5 and 6.

An overview of the indicators and parameters of target setting were presented. Participants were divided into small groups and given a data packet for reference in their discussions. The data packet showed state trends for each results indicator over the past several years. After discussion and analysis, individuals from the groups generated a recommendation for each target for the next six years. ESIT staff were present to answer any questions.

Results were compiled and the mean, median, and modes were calculated for each indicator for each year. The groups' input was consolidated into one set of indicators for each year and presented at a special APR review meeting of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) in January 2015.

January 15, 2020, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) met to reviewed all target setting for Indicators 2, 3a,b,c, 4a,b,c, 5 and 6 as a part of the annual performance review process. The Council did not directly recommend changes to any targets that were previously set, rather referred a review of the targets to the Data Committee as part of its ongoing data analysis.

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	9,054

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	9,460

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
9,054	9,460	96.21%	93.50%	95.71%	Met Target	No Slippage

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 = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.

d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.

e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.

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 = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus } \# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in category (d)}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus } \# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus } \# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus } \# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d)})] \times 100$.

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 = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus } \# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e)}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)})] \times 100$.

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

SICC Special Meeting -- Annual Performance Report (APR) Review

January 15, 2020, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) met to review the Washington State’s Part C State Annual Performance Report. The SICC provided input and requested additional clarification. Some Indicators were discussed in more detail with SICC input integrated into indicator sections as appropriate. The SICC did not directly recommend changes to any targets that were previously set, rather referred a review of the targets to the Data Committee as part of its ongoing data analysis. The Data Committee intends to integrate a racial equity mindset into each of its work plan components throughout FFY 2019.

Target Setting Meetings –Local Stakeholder Involvement

Stakeholder meetings were convened in November 2014 to discuss APR target setting. A broad range of stakeholders participated including; early intervention service providers, agency administrators, local lead agency (LLA) staff and school district staff. The group was given the task of reviewing data and making recommendations to ESIT on targets covering the next six years for Indicators 2, 3a,b,c, 4a,b,c, 5 and 6.

An overview of the indicators and parameters of target setting were presented. Participants were divided into small groups and given a data packet for reference in their discussions. The data packet showed state trends for each results indicator over the past several years. After discussion and analysis, individuals from the groups generated a recommendation for each target for the next six years. ESIT staff were present to answer any questions.

Results were compiled and the mean, median, and modes were calculated for each indicator for each year. The groups’ input was consolidated into one set of indicators for each year and presented at a special APR review

meeting of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) in January 2015.

January 15, 2020, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) met to reviewed all target setting for Indicators 2, 3a,b,c, 4a,b,c, 5 and 6 as a part of the annual performance review process. The Council did not directly recommend changes to any targets that were previously set, rather referred a review of the targets to the Data Committee as part of its ongoing data analysis.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2013	Target> =	56.21%	56.25%	56.50%	56.70%	56.80%
A1	56.21%	Data	56.21%	56.38%	56.63%	55.69%	56.74%
A2	2013	Target> =	54.77%	55.00%	55.25%	55.50%	55.75%
A2	54.77%	Data	54.77%	56.14%	56.25%	53.71%	53.54%
B1	2013	Target> =	65.11%	65.11%	65.11%	65.50%	65.75%
B1	65.11%	Data	65.11%	63.71%	64.12%	64.96%	65.22%
B2	2013	Target> =	56.79%	57.00%	57.20%	57.40%	57.60%
B2	56.79%	Data	56.79%	52.54%	51.95%	50.43%	51.96%
C1	2013	Target> =	68.26%	68.50%	68.75%	69.00%	69.25%
C1	68.26%	Data	68.26%	66.86%	66.04%	66.04%	66.29%
C2	2013	Target> =	58.17%	58.25%	58.50%	58.75%	59.00%
C2	58.17%	Data	58.17%	56.73%	54.67%	53.71%	55.04%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1>=	58.25%	58.50%
Target A2>=	56.00%	56.00%
Target B1>=	66.00%	66.25%

Target B2 >=	57.80%	57.80%
Target C1 >=	69.50%	69.50%
Target C2 >=	59.35%	59.35%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

6,476

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	76	1.17%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,788	27.61%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,024	15.81%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,665	25.71%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,923	29.69%

	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	2,689	4,553	56.74%	58.25%	59.06%	Met Target	No Slippage

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	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	3,588	6,476	53.54%	56.00%	55.40%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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	74	1.14%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,655	25.56%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,362	21.03%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,043	31.55%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,342	20.72%

	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	3,405	5,134	65.22%	66.00%	66.32%	Met Target	No Slippage

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
turned 3 years of age or exited the program							
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	3,385	6,476	51.96%	57.80%	52.27%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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	65	1.00%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,617	24.97%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,199	18.51%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,255	34.82%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,340	20.69%

	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	3,454	5,136	66.29%	69.50%	67.25%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

	Numerat or	Denomina tor	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippa ge
their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program							
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	3,595	6,476	55.04%	59.35%	55.51%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippag e

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	8,383
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.	6,482

	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

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

Outcome Measurement Policies and Procedures

Washington State’s outcome measurement policies and procedures require all eligible infants and toddlers who have received at least six months of early intervention services to have child outcome data collected at entry and exit.

Child outcome entry data is gathered prior to completing each initial IFSP, with an exception when a child entered early intervention at 30 months of age or later. Under this circumstance, the child is not required to have an entry COS rating because s/he would not have been in service for the required six-month period. All infants and toddlers, who had an entry COS and received at least six months of consecutive services, had an exit COS completed prior to leaving early intervention.

Washington State's IFSP process integrates the child outcome summary into the initial evaluation and assessment process. Training and technical assistance continue to focus on gathering functional information about the child to inform the child outcome summary rating process. Because of the integrated child outcome summary and IFSP process, evaluation and assessment data are used in a more consistent way to determine child outcome summary ratings.

Measurement Strategies and Data Collection

The child's IFSP team, which includes the child's parent, used a variety of data sources to determine the child's level of functioning in each child outcome area. IFSP teams made assessment tool selections based on the needs of the child and family. The child's functional performance was rated following the ECO child outcome summary process. The data sources used by the team included standardized tools, curriculum-based measures, parent/caregiver report, professional observations, and other relevant assessment information.

When standardized tools or curriculum-based instruments were administered, the instruments or measures most frequently used included:

- Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System for Infants and Children (AEPS) -- Birth to three Battelle Developmental Inventory
- Developmental Assessment of Young Children (DAYC) Bayley Scales of Infant and Toddler Development

Early Intervention Program Agency staff enter child outcome summary data into the data management system on an ongoing basis.

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	2013	Target >=	82.36%	82.50%	82.75%	83.00%	83.25%

A	82.36%	Data	82.36%	81.55%	81.78%	75.72%	79.17%
B	2013	Target >=	90.44%	90.50%	90.75%	91.00%	91.25%
B	90.44%	Data	90.44%	88.54%	88.39%	81.86%	85.60%
C	2013	Target >=	86.46%	86.50%	86.75%	87.00%	87.25%
C	86.46%	Data	86.46%	85.98%	87.65%	80.07%	85.10%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	83.50%	83.50%
Target B >=	91.50%	91.50%
Target C >=	87.50%	87.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

SICC Special Meeting -- Annual Performance Report (APR) Review

January 15, 2020, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) met to review the Washington State's Part C State Annual Performance Report. The SICC provided input and requested additional clarification. Some Indicators were discussed in more detail with SICC input integrated into indicator sections as appropriate. The SICC did not directly recommend changes to any targets that were previously set, rather referred a review of the targets to the Data Committee as part of its ongoing data analysis. The Data Committee intends to integrate a racial equity mindset into each of its work plan components throughout FFY 2019.

Target Setting Meetings –Local Stakeholder Involvement

Stakeholder meetings were convened in November 2014 to discuss APR target setting. A broad range of stakeholders participated including; early intervention service providers, agency administrators, local lead agency (LLA) staff and school district staff. The group was given the task of reviewing data and making recommendations to ESIT on targets covering the next six years for Indicators 2, 3a,b,c, 4a,b,c, 5 and 6.

An overview of the indicators and parameters of target setting were presented. Participants were divided into small groups and given a data packet for reference in their discussions. The data packet showed state trends for each results indicator over the past several years. After discussion and analysis, individuals from the groups generated a recommendation for each target for the next six years. ESIT staff were present to answer any questions.

Results were compiled and the mean, median, and modes were calculated for each indicator for each year. The groups' input was consolidated into one set of indicators for each year and presented at a special APR review meeting of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) in January 2015.

January 15, 2020, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) met to reviewed all target setting for Indicators 2, 3a,b,c, 4a,b,c, 5 and 6 as a part of the annual performance review process. The Council did not directly recommend changes to any targets that were previously set, rather referred a review of the targets to the Data Committee as part of its ongoing data analysis.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	6,694
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	964
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	738
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	928
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	796
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	927
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	787
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	927

	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)	79.17%	83.50%	79.53%	Did Not Meet 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)	85.60%	91.50%	85.87%	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	85.10%	87.50%	84.90%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2)					
				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.					
				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				Not applicable.	
The demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.				YES	

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

The program conducted an analysis to determine possible strategies for statewide technical assistance and guidance to help ensure progress and movement towards the targets in this indicator. The data for all local lead agencies were reviewed and disaggregated by geographical location (county and regional review) and type of organization. Other factors considered during the analysis included a review of the response rates, the degree of representativeness of the survey respondents, and the potential of non-response bias. The potential for non-response bias was minimized through an in-depth comparison of respondent and target population characteristics including race/ethnicity (seven federal race/ethnicity groups) and the length of time (0-6 months; 6-12 months; and 12 or more months) services were provided.

The analyses suggest that the results of the survey are statistically representative of the target population with small variance noted within two of the race/ethnicity groups. Parents of children identified as Hispanic/Latino are slightly under-represented, while parents of children identified as White are somewhat over-represented. Parents of children identified as Hispanic/Latino are 22% of the sample but 18% of the respondents; parents of children identified as White are 8% of the sample but 16% of the respondents. The variance represented in these two race/ethnicity groups has slightly decreased in comparison to prior year analyses. The SLA attributes the decrease in variance to supplemental follow-up calls conducted by a Spanish interpreter provided by the ESIT Program.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The SLA is currently in the process of revising the parent survey instrument and developing strategies to increase participation and access to the parent survey process for the FFY 2019 performance period. Strategies include (a) consulting with Dr. Don A. Dillman, author of Mail and Internet Surveys: The Tailored Design Method, (b) contracting with Washington State University's Social and Economic Sciences Research Center

(SESRC) to engage internal agency representatives and external stakeholders in the revision of the instrument and identification of culturally-responsive strategies to increase access and response rates, and (c) research and evaluate the feasibility of offering supplemental web-based options for administration of the survey.

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.

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	0.51%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	0.78%	0.82%	0.85%	0.89%	0.92%
Data	1.13%	1.27%	1.47%	1.44%	1.63%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	0.96%	1.21%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

SICC Special Meeting -- Annual Performance Report (APR) Review

January 15, 2020, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) met to review the Washington State's Part C State Annual Performance Report. The SICC provided input and requested additional clarification. Some Indicators were discussed in more detail with SICC input integrated into indicator sections as appropriate. The SICC did not directly recommend changes to any targets that were previously set, rather referred a review of the targets to the Data Committee as part of its ongoing data analysis. The Data Committee intends to integrate a racial equity mindset into each of its work plan components throughout FFY 2019.

Target Setting Meetings –Local Stakeholder Involvement

Stakeholder meetings were convened in November 2014 to discuss APR target setting. A broad range of stakeholders participated including; early intervention service providers, agency administrators, local lead agency (LLA) staff and school district staff. The group was given the task of reviewing data and making recommendations to ESIT on targets covering the next six years for Indicators 2, 3a,b,c, 4a,b,c, 5 and 6.

An overview of the indicators and parameters of target setting were presented. Participants were divided into small groups and given a data packet for reference in their discussions. The data packet showed state trends for each results indicator over the past several years. After discussion and analysis, individuals from the groups generated a recommendation for each target for the next six years. ESIT staff were present to answer any questions.

Results were compiled and the mean, median, and modes were calculated for each indicator for each year. The groups' input was consolidated into one set of indicators for each year and presented at a special APR review meeting of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) in January 2015.

January 15, 2020, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) met to reviewed all target setting for Indicators 2, 3a,b,c, 4a,b,c, 5 and 6 as a part of the annual performance review process. The Council did not directly recommend changes to any targets that were previously set, rather referred a review of the targets to the Data Committee as part of its ongoing data analysis.

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	1,765
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	90,662

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
1,765	90,662	1.63%	0.96%	1.95%	Met Target	No Slippage

Compare your results to the national data

(Sources: Grads360; the number and percent of infants and toddlers receiving early intervention services under IDEA, Part C, by age and state; Institution: U.S. Department of Education; Publication Year: 2017
<https://osep.grads360.org/#communities/pdc/documents/9795>)

When comparing Washington State data with national data for Indicator 5, Washington was above the national average. Washington's data for this indicator was 1.94%, and the national average for this indicator was 1.25%.

This reflects state and local efforts to better identify eligible infants under the age of 12 months. ESIT collected data for this indicator in the statewide data management system. Local lead agencies have access to a report in state's data management system (DMS) that provides the percent of children from birth to one year old with IFSPs compared the state total population of children from birth to one year old at a point-in-time.

We anticipate an increase number of children served with Washington States continued efforts to support universal developmental screenings for all children. Statewide Parent/Caregiver Outreach and Public Awareness Parent/caregiver awareness about the importance of developmental screening increased over the past year through Washington's WithinReach and Parent Help 123/Help Me Grow websites: <http://www.withinreachwa.org/> and <http://www.parenthelp123.org/child-development/help-me-grow-washington>.

WithinReach Family Health Hotline continued to serve as ESIT's central directory contractor and provided statewide information and referral to ESIT Family Resources Coordinators (FRCs). WithinReach Family Health Hotline continued to be the 1-800 number families call if they have concerns or questions about their child's development or need to find out how to access public health insurance, immunizations for their child, food or housing assistance, etc.

CHILD Profile continued to serve as an effective ESIT public awareness resource to families. CHILD Profile is a program of the Department of Health (DOH) that provided immunization tracking and continued to distribute free child development and health information for Washington families that have children ages birth to six years of age. CHILD Profile continued to serve as Washington State's Health Promotion and Immunization Registry system. ESIT continued to contract with CHILD Profile to distribute three specific targeted mailings to families statewide with information on how children grow and develop. This information also included the WithinReach Family Health Hotline phone number, should families have a concern about their child's development. Parents of all children born in Washington State get these free materials. Children and families who move into the state could also be added to the system by their health care provider. Parents were also able to sign up directly to receive the materials. For more information about CHILD Profile, go to

<https://www.doh.wa.gov/YouandYourFamily/Immunization/ChildProfileHealthPromotion/ForParents>

Some local lead agencies reported local initiatives to increase child find in their counties. This included

- Collaborating with neonatal programs on building relationships and understanding to improve referral channels into early intervention.
- Developing memorandums of understanding with Early Head Start and other home visiting programs as a part of the State Systemic Improvement Plan efforts.
- King County, the state’s largest county is working on a Developmental Screening initiative that resulted in 500 people trained on completing the ASQ. Those trained include a variety of early learning professionals and family members.

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	1.79%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	2.26%	2.32%	2.38%	2.43%	2.49%
Data	2.28%	2.44%	2.69%	2.77%	2.99%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	2.55%	2.80%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**SICC Special Meeting -- Annual Performance Report (APR) Review**

January 15, 2020, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) met to review the Washington State's Part C State Annual Performance Report. The SICC provided input and requested additional clarification. Some Indicators were discussed in more detail with SICC input integrated into indicator sections as appropriate. The SICC did not directly recommend changes to any targets that were previously set, rather referred a review of the targets to the Data Committee as part of its ongoing data analysis. The Data Committee intends to integrate a racial equity mindset into each of its work plan components throughout FFY 2019.

Target Setting Meetings –Local Stakeholder Involvement

Stakeholder meetings were convened in November 2014 to discuss APR target setting. A broad range of stakeholders participated including; early intervention service providers, agency administrators, local lead agency (LLA) staff and school district staff. The group was given the task of reviewing data and making recommendations to ESIT on targets covering the next six years for Indicators 2, 3a,b,c, 4a,b,c, 5 and 6.

An overview of the indicators and parameters of target setting were presented. Participants were divided into small groups and given a data packet for reference in their discussions. The data packet showed state trends for each results indicator over the past several years. After discussion and analysis, individuals from the groups generated a recommendation for each target for the next six years. ESIT staff were present to answer any questions.

Results were compiled and the mean, median, and modes were calculated for each indicator for each year. The groups' input was consolidated into one set of indicators for each year and presented at a special APR review meeting of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) in January 2015.

January 15, 2020, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) met to reviewed all target setting for Indicators 2, 3a,b,c, 4a,b,c, 5 and 6 as a part of the annual performance review process. The Council did not directly recommend changes to any targets that were previously set, rather referred a review of the targets to the Data Committee as part of its ongoing data analysis.

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	9,460
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More	06/20/2019	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	275,829

Source	Date	Description	Data
Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin			

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
9,460	275,829	2.99%	2.55%	3.43%	Met Target	No Slippage

Compare your results to the national data

(Sources: Grads360; the number and percent of infants and toddlers receiving early intervention services under IDEA, Part C, by age and state; Institution: U.S. Department of Education; Publication Year: 2017 <https://osep.grads360.org/#communities/pdc/documents/9795>)

When comparing Washington State data with national data for Indicator 6, Washington was below the national average. Washington's data for this indicator was 3.45%, and the national average for this indicator was 3.26%. However, Washington continues to increase the percentage of children served each year and exceeding the state's target. This reflects the effort that has been made at both the state and local level to reach out and identify more infants and toddlers that are eligible for early intervention services.

Local lead agencies have access to a report in state's data management system (DMS) that provides the percent of children from birth to three year old with IFSPs compared the state total population of children from birth to one year old at a point-in-time.

We anticipate a continuous increase number of children served with the Washington States continued efforts to support universal developmental screenings for all children. Statewide Parent/Caregiver Outreach and Public Awareness Parent/caregiver awareness about the importance of developmental screening increased over the past year through Washington's WithinReach and Parent Help 123/Help Me Grow websites: <http://www.withinreachwa.org/> and <http://www.parenthelp123.org/child-development/help-me-grow-washington>.

WithinReach Family Health Hotline continued to serve as ESIT's central directory contractor and provided statewide information and referral to ESIT Family Resources Coordinators (FRCs). WithinReach Family Health Hotline continued to be the 1-800 number families call if they have concerns or questions about their child's development or need to find out how to access public health insurance, immunizations for their child, food or housing assistance, etc.

CHILD Profile continued to serve as an effective ESIT public awareness resource to families. CHILD Profile is a program of the Department of Health (DOH) that provided immunization tracking and continued to distribute free child development and health information for Washington families that have children ages birth to six

years of age. CHILD Profile continued to serve as Washington State’s Health Promotion and Immunization Registry system. ESIT continued to contract with CHILD Profile to distribute three specific targeted mailings to families statewide with information on how children grow and develop. This information also included the WithinReach Family Health Hotline phone number, should families have a concern about their child’s development. Parents of all children born in Washington State get these free materials. Children and families who move into the state could also be added to the system by their health care provider. Parents were also able to sign up directly to receive the materials. For more information about CHILD Profile, go to <https://www.doh.wa.gov/YouandYourFamily/Immunization/ChildProfileHealthPromotion/ForParents>.

Some local lead agencies reported local initiatives to increase child find in their counties. This included

- Collaborating with neonatal programs on building relationships and understanding to improve referral channels into early intervention.
- Developing memorandums of understanding with Early Head Start and other home visiting programs as a part of the State Systemic Improvement Plan efforts.
- King County, the state’s largest county is working on a Developmental Screening initiative that resulted in 500 people trained on completing the ASQ. Those trained include a variety of early learning professionals and family members.

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	2005	85.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	96.67%	92.21%	93.67%	91.90%	91.43%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1,406	2,113	91.43%	100%	90.77%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

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

512

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

State database

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

Data were collected from July 1, 2018 through September 30, 2018 and was obtained from all IFSPs entered into the ESIT Data Management System (DMS) during this period.

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

The three months of data collected from all IFSPs during this period contained the full range of variability exhibited by the population served by ESIT throughout the year. The data is from all programs across the state making it representative of the entire state.

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
145	145	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

The ESIT program verified that it corrected all findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02.

ESIT staff, Local Lead Agency (LLA) administrators, Family Resources Coordinators (FRCs), and providers used the ESIT Data Management System (DMS) IFSP Compliance Report to review data.

From the date the LLA received a finding letter for noncompliance, the LLA had one year to correct identified non-compliance for each indicator not meeting 100%. Each LLA reviewed compliance reports from the DMS to ensure data was entered accurately into the system and that the regulatory requirements regarding timely service provision were being met

To verify that noncompliance was correctly addressing the regulatory requirements, each LLA reviewed and identified a minimum of two weeks of DMS data. If data demonstrated compliance for each indicator where findings were issued, compliance was considered achieved. The LLA then submitted the DMS data to ESIT staff for reverification. After ESIT staff verified the data submitted, (and verified correction of individual child noncompliance, ESIT staff sent a letter documenting that noncompliance was fully corrected.

If correction of non-compliance has not been verified within one-year of the findings, ESIT staff notifies the LLA that they must develop a CAP. During FFY17, no LLA met the criteria for needing a CAP.

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

ESIT staff verified correction of each individual incidence of non-compliance through the ESIT data management system (DMS). The DMS provides a referral date, an Initial IFSP due date and the actual date the Initial IFSP was issued for every new IFSP. If an Initial IFSP was late, the DMS requires the user to enter a reason for the delay.

Late Exceptional Family Circumstance (EFC): extraordinary events that prevent the family from participating in required events on time.

Late Other: events identified by the early intervention program or provider and not the family that prevent required events from being completed on time.

ESIT staff reviewed compliance reports from the DMS during the annual compliance monitoring period and subsequent intervals as needed to verify each individual instance of noncompliance is corrected unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the local lead agency, the family declined services, or the local lead agency was unable to make contact with the family.

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom

the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 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	76.00%			
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 only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday. (yes/no)

YES

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1,247	1,247	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

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

0

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

State database

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

Data were collected from July 1, 2018 through September 30, 2018 and was obtained from all IFSPs entered into the ESIT Data Management System (DMS) during this period.

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

The three months of data collected from all IFSPs during this period contained the full range of variability exhibited by the population served by ESIT throughout the year. The data is from all programs across the state making it representative of the entire state.

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 = $\left[\frac{\text{(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday)}}{\text{(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)}} \right] \times 100$.

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

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

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	95.00%			
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

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
1,212	1,212	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

The ESIT Data Management System (DMS) business rules requires local lead agencies (LLA) administrators, family resources coordinators (FRCs), and service providers to document in the DMS if a child was potentially eligible for Part B. ESIT, the state lead agency (SLA), generates notifications from the DMS to the state education agency(SEA) and local education agency (LEA).

LEA Notification. Potential eligibility for Part B special education documentation resulted in the DMS generating notifications. The DMS sent an automated electronic notification to all LEAs informing them of potentially eligible toddlers that would soon be transitioning from early intervention.

SEA Notification. ESIT staff manually sent the required notification to the SEA data manager. SEA and LEA notifications occur monthly. Because of the structure of the DMS, individual instances of noncompliance could not occur regarding this indicator.

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

NO

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

State database

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

Data were collected from July 1, 2018 through September 30, 2018 and was obtained from all IFSPs entered into the ESIT Data Management System (DMS) during this period.

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

The three months of data collected from all IFSPs during this period contained the full range of variability exhibited by the population served by ESIT throughout the year. The data is from all programs across the state making it representative of the entire state.

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	80.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	96.68%	96.92%	95.48%	98.52%	96.96%

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

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
975	1,212	96.96%	100%	97.20%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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.

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.

103

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

State database

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

Data were collected from July 1, 2018 through September 30, 2018 and was obtained from all IFSPs entered into the ESIT Data Management System (DMS) during this period.

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

The three months of data collected from all IFSPs during this period contained the full range of variability exhibited by the population served by ESIT throughout the year. The data is from all programs across the state making it representative of the entire state.

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
32	32	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**

The ESIT program verified that it corrected all findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02.

ESIT staff, Local Lead Agency (LLA) administrators, Family Resources Coordinators (FRCs), and providers used the ESIT Data Management System (DMS) IFSP Compliance Report to review data.

From the date the LLA received a finding letter for noncompliance, the LLA had one year to correct identified non-compliance for each indicator not meeting 100%. Each LLA reviewed compliance reports from the DMS to ensure data was entered accurately into the system and that the regulatory requirements regarding timely service provision were being met.

To verify that noncompliance was correctly addressing the regulatory requirements, each LLA reviewed and identified a minimum of two weeks of DMS data. If data demonstrated compliance for each indicator where findings were issued, compliance was considered achieved. The LLA then submitted the DMS data to ESIT staff for reverification. After ESIT staff verified the data submitted, (and verified correction of individual child noncompliance, ESIT staff sent a letter documenting that noncompliance was fully corrected.

If correction of non-compliance has not been verified within one-year of the findings, ESIT staff notifies the LLA that they must develop a CAP. During FFY17, no LLA met the criteria for needing a CAP.

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

ESIT staff verified correction of each individual incidence of non-compliance through the ESIT data management system (DMS). The DMS provides a transition conference due date and an actual date when the transition conference occurred for each child record required to have a transition conference. If a transition conference was late, the DMS requires the user to enter a reason for the delay.

Late Exceptional Family Circumstance (EFC): extraordinary events that prevent the family from participating in required events on time.

Late Other: events identified by the early intervention program or provider and not the family that prevent required events from being completed on time.

ESIT staff reviewed compliance reports from the DMS during the annual compliance monitoring period and subsequent intervals as needed to verify each individual instance of noncompliance is corrected unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the local lead agency, the family declined services, or the local lead agency was unable to make contact with the family.

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

SICC Special Meeting -- Annual Performance Report (APR) Review

January 15, 2020, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) met to review the Washington State's Part C State Annual Performance Report. The SICC provided input and requested additional clarification. Some Indicators were discussed in more detail with SICC input integrated into indicator sections as appropriate. The

SICC did not directly recommend changes to any targets that were previously set, rather referred a review of the targets to the Data Committee as part of its ongoing data analysis. The Data Committee intends to integrate a racial equity mindset into each of its work plan components throughout FFY 2019.

Target Setting Meetings –Local Stakeholder Involvement

Stakeholder meetings were convened in November 2014 to discuss APR target setting. A broad range of stakeholders participated including; early intervention service providers, agency administrators, local lead agency (LLA) staff and school district staff. The group was given the task of reviewing data and making recommendations to ESIT on targets covering the next six years for Indicators 2, 3a,b,c, 4a,b,c, 5 and 6.

An overview of the indicators and parameters of target setting were presented. Participants were divided into small groups and given a data packet for reference in their discussions. The data packet showed state trends for each results indicator over the past several years. After discussion and analysis, individuals from the groups generated a recommendation for each target for the next six years. ESIT staff were present to answer any questions.

Results were compiled and the mean, median, and modes were calculated for each indicator for each year. The groups' input was consolidated into one set of indicators for each year and presented at a special APR review meeting of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) in January 2015.

January 15, 2020, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) met to reviewed all target setting for Indicators 2, 3a,b,c, 4a,b,c, 5 and 6 as a part of the annual performance review process. The Council did not directly recommend changes to any targets that were previously set, rather referred a review of the targets to the Data Committee as part of its ongoing data analysis.

Historical Data

Baseline	0	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	0.00%	0.00%

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		0.00%		N/A	N/A

Targets

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

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

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

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	0
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	0
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	0

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

SICC Special Meeting -- Annual Performance Report (APR) Review

January 15, 2020, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) met to review the Washington State's Part C State Annual Performance Report. The SICC provided input and requested additional clarification. Some Indicators were discussed in more detail with SICC input integrated into indicator sections as appropriate. The SICC did not directly recommend changes to any targets that were previously set, rather referred a review of the targets to the Data Committee as part of its ongoing data analysis. The Data Committee intends to integrate a racial equity mindset into each of its work plan components throughout FFY 2019.

Target Setting Meetings –Local Stakeholder Involvement

Stakeholder meetings were convened in November 2014 to discuss APR target setting. A broad range of stakeholders participated including; early intervention service providers, agency administrators, local lead agency (LLA) staff and school district staff. The group was given the task of reviewing data and making recommendations to ESIT on targets covering the next six years for Indicators 2, 3a,b,c, 4a,b,c, 5 and 6.

An overview of the indicators and parameters of target setting were presented. Participants were divided into small groups and given a data packet for reference in their discussions. The data packet showed state trends for each results indicator over the past several years. After discussion and analysis, individuals from the groups generated a recommendation for each target for the next six years. ESIT staff were present to answer any questions.

Results were compiled and the mean, median, and modes were calculated for each indicator for each year. The

groups' input was consolidated into one set of indicators for each year and presented at a special APR review meeting of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) in January 2015.

January 15, 2020, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) met to reviewed all target setting for Indicators 2, 3a,b,c, 4a,b,c, 5 and 6 as a part of the annual performance review process. The Council did not directly recommend changes to any targets that were previously set, rather referred a review of the targets to the Data Committee as part of its ongoing data analysis.

Historical Data

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

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	0.00%	

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
0	0	0		0.00%		N/A	N/A

Targets

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

During FFY2017, Washington State did not have any mediations.

Certification

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:

Judy King

Title:

Family Support Programs Director

Email:

judy.king@dcyf.wa.gov

Phone:

360-725-2841

Submitted on:

01/31/20 3:11:19 PM

Early Support for Infants and Toddlers | Antalan Family Vignette

Antalan Family Vignette:

My name is E Renae` Antalan. I am a Desert Storm Army Veteran and GrandParent with a capital **P** because I have been raising my two grandchildren, ages 5-1/2 and 4-1/2, since the youngest was a day old. Their parents' drug addiction turned my life upside-down.

I noticed something was just not right and my grandkids were not developing along with their peers. I knew they needed help and I had to find resources to assist them. I started researching, sought out and found South Sound Parent to Parent. I walked into their office alone, with many questions and little sleep. I walked out two-hours later, with a pep in my step, fully alert, and having a motivated early intervention team at my shoulders. Within 45-days, I had my first home visit, therapy referrals, and our home schedule and appointments just blew up from there.



The support services we received and the compassionate & knowledgeable professionals behind them have just been truly amazing, uplifting, and tremendously beneficial. It has set my kids and their peers on the path to success! My grandkids are now attending a combination of kindergarten, Head Start and Preschool, leading very busy, productive, and educational lives. *I could have been the parent who did not see, or the parent who saw, and did not do. But I am the parent that knew something had to be done and did!*

I am now one of the many advocates to be there for those who need guidance help, and in some cases, a gentle nudge in the right direction. Just as it was my honor to have served our country, it is just as important that I serve and protect the littlest voice!

Thank you for your time and attention in allowing me to share my story.

E Renae` Antalan

Motivated GrandParent & Guardian

Parent Institute for Engagement Graduate 2019

State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) Parent/Caregiver Representative

Early Support for Infants and Toddlers | Allen Family Vignette

Allen Family Vignette:

Hello. My name is Vanessa Allen. I am the mother of three children. My youngest son Ezra was diagnosed with Trisomy 21 most commonly known as Down Syndrome (DS) at birth.

He was born at 41 weeks and weighted 8 lbs. 13 oz. A few minutes after I gave birth, my doctor pulled up a chair and held my hand and said, "Vanessa, do you see anything wrong with Ezra?"

At that point, all my fears and doubts came true and my heart felt as if it broke into several pieces and there was not enough glue in this world to help fix it.

At our one-month well-child check, our provider referred us to Children's Village in Yakima to receive Early Intervention services. At that time, I did not know much about Children's Village or what early intervention services they provided.

Ezra was enrolled in the Birth to Three program and qualified for water therapy, speech therapy, occupational therapy, physical therapy, and feeding therapy. All these therapies helped with his cognitive, physical, sensory, and motor skills.

I am forever grateful for these therapies and Children's Village. I strongly believe that if it had not been for Children's Village and their amazing team, Ezra would not be where he is now. They will always hold a special place in my heart.



The mission of the ESIT program is to build upon family strengths by providing coordination, supports, resources and services to enhance development of children with developmental delays and disabilities through everyday learning opportunities.
