

# **STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART C**

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

**For reporting on  
FFY 2019**

**District of Columbia**



**PART C DUE  
February 1, 2021**

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

## Introduction

### Instructions

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

### Intro - Indicator Data

#### Executive Summary

The District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE), DC Early Intervention Program (DC EIP), is the lead agency for administering Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 2004, and its implementation. The District of Columbia established new eligibility criteria beginning July 1, 2018. The new criteria is now 25 percent or more delay in at least one of the developmental areas rather than a 50 percent in one area or 25 percent in two areas.

As the lead agency for IDEA, Part C, OSSE sets high expectations, provides resources and support, and exercises accountability to ensure a statewide, comprehensive, coordinated, multidisciplinary, interagency system that provides high-quality early intervention services to infants and toddlers with developmental delays and disabilities and their families. As the single point of entry for infants and toddlers with suspected developmental delays and disabilities from birth to the third birthday, DC EIP identifies and evaluates infants and toddlers with suspected developmental delays and provides high-quality, age appropriate early intervention services for eligible children and their families. OSSE DC EIP is committed to ensuring that all children who need early intervention services are able to access them. DC EIP Child Find partners conduct weekly outreach, provide targeted communications, and have well-developed partnerships that ensure all families are aware of DC EIP services and supports. DC EIP has built awareness, enhanced its feedback loops with referring partners, offered monthly screenings and restructured playgroups to include developmental screenings. In the District of Columbia the DC EIP is the only program and it serves all the children in Part C.

The State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) for Federal Fiscal Year 2019 (FFY 19) details the work of OSSE towards improving outcomes of infants and toddlers with developmental delays and disabilities and their families. This SPP/APR is due Feb. 1, 2021 and covers FFY 19 (July 1, 2019 - June 30, 2020). It is divided into eight results and three compliance national indicators. C-11, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), will be submitted on April 1, 2021. This annual data collection and review process allows OSSE to make data-based decisions that ensure the appropriate allocation of resources to areas of greatest need.

Key accomplishments during the reporting period include:

DC EIP issued a new solicitation for direct services and awarded a contract to nine agencies. The contract includes the following new requirements for early intervention services:

- Contractor shall provide all four core services: speech, physical, occupational, and developmental therapy.
- Contractor needs to designate a clinical supervisor and a program supervisor.
- Early interventionists can work for no more than two contractors.
- Early interventionists must provide at least five direct service hours per week.
- Teaming and joint visits: Service Coordinators (SCs) need to participate in teaming. Contractor to meet 1 hour per month for every 75 cases.
- Contractor must be in network with all Managed Care Organizations (MCOs).
- AEPS Interrater Reliability – mandatory for all early interventionists.

This contract will enhance accountability, increase consistency of service delivery and improve fidelity for evidence based practices.

#### Data Sharing

DC EIP holds monthly meetings with provider representatives, and the Directors of Case Management and Care Manager Supervisors to discuss various performance indicators:

- 30-day timeline
- Authorization upload times
- IFSP attendance
- Service issues
- MCO children discussed during teaming meetings.
- Number of joint visits and outcomes
- Distribution of service and evaluation referrals

#### Additional information related to data collection and reporting

#### General Supervision System

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

In the District of Columbia, OSSE is the lead agency for purposes of the IDEA Part C. IDEA requires that the lead agency have a system of general supervision that has multiple mechanisms to support and oversee the DC EIP system. The lead agency is responsible for administering the grant and for monitoring the implementation of IDEA Part C. As such, the lead agency conducts monitoring activities and makes annual determinations on compliance about the performance of the local program to ensure compliance with IDEA Part C. The lead agency also publicly reports annually on the performance of the lead agency. The primary focus of the lead agency's monitoring activities is to improve outcomes for all infants and toddlers with developmental delays and disabilities and their families while also ensuring that all early intervention programs meet the requirements of IDEA Part C. OSSE's monitoring approach is outcome-oriented. To achieve the desired performance results, OSSE works collaboratively with early intervention contracted programs and engages in shared accountability practices that maximize success for all infants and toddlers with developmental delays and disabilities. These accountability practices include database reviews, record reviews, dispute resolution systems (i.e., due process hearings, complaints and mediation), annual review of service provider contract provisions and audit reviews of vendor invoices to ensure services are provided in a manner consistent with Individualized Family Service Plans. OSSE's monitoring system identifies noncompliance with the ultimate goal of improving outcomes for all infants and toddlers with developmental delays and disabilities and their families. While monitoring activities must, by federal law, examine compliance issues, OSSE has deliberately structured its monitoring approach to address the broader purposes of IDEA which include delivering services in the natural learning environment, parent support and teamwork. This is emphasized through a review of and response to data in these areas. Since December 2017, DC EIP transitioned the dedicated service coordinator contractors to full-time District of Columbia employees, allowing the program to provide families with one service coordinator for the duration of their time in the program. Additionally, DC EIP created three regions across the District

and assigned a service coordination supervisor and a team of service coordinators (SC) to each region. This regional approach allows the service coordinators to focus on one region of the city and become more familiar with the community and its resources, and increases community engagement and partnerships with key organizations and agencies. Service coordinators in all eight wards provide targeted and consistent support to families from the time they are referred to DC EIP until they exit the program.

#### **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 sole EIS provider in the District, OSSE utilizes technical assistance (TA) centers funded by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA) center assisted DC EIP in reviewing and revising general supervision, and developing the SPP/APR. The Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy) continues to provide guidance on the development of the Part C data system, the review of the data for development of the annual SPP/APR and evaluation activities of the SSIP. DC EIP will continue to access the TA centers in the upcoming fiscal year as we continue to implement the SSIP.

A key feature of OSSE's system of general supervision is the direct linkage between monitoring activities, technical assistance and professional development. DC EIP also conducts targeted trainings to address gaps and additional needs for providers, service coordinators and intake specialists. OSSE requires all evaluation, direct service and service coordination personnel to complete a series of training modules (Contemporary Practices in Early Intervention) on working with infants and toddlers with developmental delays and disabilities and their families before they are allowed to work in DC EIP. The training includes an overview of IDEA and its related requirements. Trainings are conducted on an interdisciplinary basis. In addition, targeted technical assistance is provided to evaluation and direct service providers, primary referral sources, paraprofessionals and service coordinators. OSSE ensures that the training provided helps providers improve understanding of the basic components of early intervention services available in District and supports providers to meet the interrelated social/emotional, health, developmental and educational needs of eligible children under IDEA, Part C and assist families in enhancing the development of their children and fully participating in the development and implementation of IFSPs. All service provider personnel must complete the series of online training modules and an in-person DC EIP foundation training on early intervention practices prior to receiving a referral for service. DC EIP also conducts monthly training sessions that are mandatory for all service coordination, evaluation and direct services providers. Technical assistance is required for vendors or providers that the system identifies as demonstrating persistent noncompliance in an identified area. Any provider needing assistance can request an individualized onsite or field training to ensure that appropriate procedures or evaluation/assessment protocols are being followed.

#### **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.**

The DC EIP, Strong Start, supports and complies with the federal law and regulations that require early intervention services to be family centered, community-based, and provided in the natural environment, to the maximum extent appropriate.

Natural environments are more than places. The critical component of early intervention practice is to embed services and supports into naturally occurring learning opportunities. Natural environments are settings where the child, family, and care providers participate in everyday routines and activities that are important to them and serve as important learning opportunities. Using a coaching interaction style, early intervention providers support families to promote functional participation in these activities. A provider coaching a mother to use techniques to help her son pick up and hold a spoon, fill it with yogurt and get it to his mouth during breakfast in the kitchen at their home so that he can learn to feed himself and enjoy a meal with his family is an example of providing interventions in a natural environment. Interventions within the context of a naturally occurring learning activity create opportunities for children to learn and practice skills that promote participation, build relationships and get their needs and wants met. The key mechanisms that DC EIP has in place to ensure and support effective service delivery include: " or something like that, and then number or italicize the subsequence headings.

#### **Primary Service Provided (PSP) and teaming approach**

As part of the Natural Learning Environment Practices ( NLEP) framework, Strong Start will implement the primary service provider and teaming approach by July of 2021, in which families are matched with a lead early interventionist who serves as the primary provider on the child's team. A child's team will include interventionists from all disciplines who can support the family and the primary provider in addressing their child's specific developmental needs. This approach, as part of the evidence-based natural learning environment practices, will continue to improve outcomes for children with developmental delays or disabilities and their families.

In February of 2020, OSSE issued a solicitation to contract for service delivery for the four core disciplines (Speech Therapy (ST), Physical Therapy (PT), Occupational Therapy (OT) and Developmental Therapy (DT)). This change was needed in order to start the implementation of the primary service provider (PSP) and teaming approach.

Out of the former 24 vendor agencies providing direct early intervention services as of March 2020, only 12 responded to the solicitation. A total of 16 agencies submitted a response. OSSE selected and awarded contracts to nine agencies effective Oct. 1, 2020, that are qualified contractors to provide an early intervention team capable of providing all four core services to every family they serve.

Strong Start facilitated a smooth transition for families. Of the roughly 24 percent of Strong Start children who had the potential to be affected by this transition, 98 percent have successfully transitioned to new vendors (the others are on hold due to COVID-19 and the family's decision to pause services), and 58 percent were able to continue with their previous therapist, who transitioned to a new vendor who is in the system. Overall, only about 11 percent of children experienced a change in interventionists as a result of this transition.

Data also reflects how important this transition was to bring all families into the same network of providers regardless of their insurance and build the capacity of the system. Effective Oct. 1, 2020, all the current vendors are credentialed with Medicaid Managed Care Organizations (MCOs) whereas before, 71 percent of children who transitioned vendors as a result of this transition had been with vendors not credentialed with some or any of the MCOs. This is huge progress that will yield long-term benefits for the system, children and families.

Strong Start is now on track to fully implement the PSP and teaming approach by July of 2021.

#### **Professional Development**

In March of 2020, Strong Start started the Early Intervention Teaming and Coaching Handbook study group in order to ensure that Strong Start leadership, Strong Start staff and vendor agencies obtain foundational knowledge about coaching and teaming and are able to support early interventionists in the system.

The book study group was done in three different cohorts. The first cohort, Strong Start leadership, included the director, program manager, clinical manager and three service coordination supervisors. The second cohort included all Strong Start staff including service coordinators, early intervention specialists, child find personnel and evaluation team. The last cohort included the clinical supervisors at each vendor agency.

The Strong Start Reflection Group is an initiative created in 2019 where providers in the DC early intervention community can come together monthly to discuss issues related to using a coaching interaction style, family-related challenges and challenges related to delivery of early intervention services in child development centers. The group is also an opportunity to reflect on what providers have been doing to support families in early intervention and to engage in peer coaching opportunities with current providers in the DC early intervention system.

In Fiscal Year 2020 (FY 20), Strong Start held 13 sessions and some of the topics included Teaming across agencies, supporting families with feeding challenges in the Natural Learning Environment, coaching families through new routines, coaching during the COVID-19 public health emergency, and cultural humility.

In FY 20, we had 104 total unique service providers participate across the 13 Reflection Group opportunities from three different units within our EI system (service coordinators, clinical team/early interventionists, and child find outreach specialists).

All (100 percent) of the respondents to the Reflection Group Survey rated the initiative as Effective or Highly Effective in enhancing their knowledge of effective teaming and NLEP implementation. In addition, 90 percent of respondents rated the groups as Effective or Highly Effective in providing opportunities for them to address case-specific barriers to implementing the coaching interaction style and teaming approach to service delivery.

DC EIP is continuing to provide professional development on utilizing the primary service provider approach. See Appendix A Primary Service Provider Roadmap

#### **Stakeholder Involvement:**

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

OSSE ensures that stakeholders and the public are constantly engaged in DC EIP activities through regular meetings of the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC), the State Early Childhood Development Coordinating Council (SECDCC) monthly meetings with providers and partner agencies and regular communications to stakeholders. These opportunities create continuous feedback loops that allow for continuous improvement with stakeholder involvement. During provider meetings procedural and operational changes are discussed and agreed upon. Documentation and any data system questions are addressed and suggested improvements are offered. During FFY 19, OSSE met regularly with the ICC and DC EIP to discuss ongoing performance. OSSE has been meeting biweekly with Medicaid partners to establish reimbursement schedules and for claiming of provided services. The ICC met and developed new targets for results indicators for 2019.

On March 16, 2020, the offices of the state lead agency (OSSE) and the early intervention service (EIS) provider (Strong Start, DC's Early Intervention Program (DC EIP)) closed due to public health and safety concerns as a result of a coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak in the area and did not provide Part C services to infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families during this period of Monday, March 16, 2020 through Tuesday, March 31, 2020.

During the weeks that the program was closed, DC EIP worked on developing guidance to be able to resume services remotely. DC EIP partnered with the Department of Health Care Finance (DHCF) to ensure that all services delivered via telehealth were covered by DHCF and the MCOs. On April 1, 2020, Strong Start resumed the delivery of Part C services remotely via telehealth. The term telehealth includes services delivered by phone (audio) or through video conferencing (audio-visual) technology. See Appendix B Covid Reponse.

This unprecedented time required DC EIP to refocus our work with a high emphasis on our stakeholders needs. DC EIP held biweekly calls with all the providers, monthly calls from service coordinators to families and surveyed to interventionists and families concerning how telehealth was working and what it would take to go back to in person services.

The goal of the family survey was to identify if parents are interested in resuming in-person visits, and if they have received services during the public health emergency via telehealth, to hear about their experience. The survey was sent to 1,082 families and 365 survey responses were received. A total of 306 families reported receiving early intervention services via telehealth during the public health emergency. Overall, families that are receiving services via telehealth are satisfied with service delivery and several families appear to be open to resuming a combination of services and/or ready to resume in-person services with the necessary precautions at this time.

The goal of the early interventionist survey was to solicit feedback on their experience with the early intervention services given through telehealth and to inform Strong Start about their preferences for resuming in-person visits. The survey was sent to 195 providers and 141 survey responses were received. Overall, the survey provided positive feedback supportive of a flexible, fluid, and structured transition to telehealth services in early intervention. Concerns were mostly oriented around CDC guidance implementation across all-natural learning environments and continuing to support all early interventionists with research-based safety practices.

See Appendix C Family Telehealth Survey and Appendix D Interventionist Telehealth Survey for detailed survey results.

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

NO

#### **Reporting to the Public:**

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

To review the Districts reports go to <https://osse.dc.gov/> then the link. <https://osse.dc.gov/publication/report-public-ffy2018>

OSSE reported to the public the FFY 18 performance on the targets in the SPP/APR by publishing the APR on OSSE's website. In accordance with 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A), and OSSE posted the FFY 18 Report to the Public the performance of the early intervention program located in the District.

#### **Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions**

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 5; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term

outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

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

## **Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

### **Intro - OSEP Response**

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

### **Intro - Required Actions**

### **Intro - State Attachments**



Appendix A Roadmap  
for Primary Service Pr



Appendix B Covid  
Response Final Doc.doc



Appendix C Family  
Telehealth Survey176



Appendix D  
Telehealth Interventio

# Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

## Instructions and Measurement

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

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

### Data Source

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

### Measurement

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

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

### Instructions

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

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

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

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	37.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	85.82%	78.43%	99.65%	87.44%	94.02%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
173	222	94.02%	100%	91.89%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Due to moving to telehealth service delivery there was a learning curve for some staff to utilize the platforms which caused some delays.

**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.*

31

**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).**

The States criteria for timely receipt of services is within 30 days from the time of parent signing the IFSP services begin.

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

State database

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

The District utilized fourth quarter data (April 1, 2020 - June 30, 2020) of FFY 2019

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

Clearly the 4th quarter reporting period April 1, 2020 through June 30, 2020 was different due to the challenges to the unprecedented pandemic. We believe the quarter was representative as could be expected given the implementation of new procedures to follow CDC guidance. We do believe the data is accurate and reliable.

**If needed, provide additional information about this indicator here.**

A drop down menu captures reason for delay such as exceptional family circumstances , including individual cases due to the pandemic , evaluation delay, Managed Care Organization (MCO) delay or service coordinator delay. All instances of exceptional family circumstances were reviewed through a record review to verify that documentation was available to support family delay.

While FFY 18 data reflected less than 100 percent compliance for children with IFSPs to begin services within Part C's 30-day timeline, no findings were issued because correction according to federal requirements was verified before a finding was issued. Upon record reviews conducted for those children it was verified that correction had occurred prior to issuance of findings. All children did receive their IFSP services although late and not within the 30-day timeline.

In addition, for prong two of verification, the state did another review of subsequent data through a review of sample records which verified that all children in the new sample received the services on their IFSP in a timely manner (within 30 days).

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

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

**1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**1 - OSEP Response**

**1 - Required Actions**

Because the District of Columbia reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the District of Columbia must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the District of Columbia must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly

implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the District of Columbia must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

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



## Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	55.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target>=	95.10%	95.20%	95.30%	95.40%	95.50%
Data	98.90%	98.85%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target>=	98.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/08/2020	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	971
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/08/2020	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	979

### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of Infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
971	979	100.00%	98.00%	99.18%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**2 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**2 - OSEP Response**

**2 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

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

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

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

#### Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

##### Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

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

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

##### Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 3 - Indicator Data

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

NO

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

#### Historical Data

Outcome	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A1	2008	Target>=	63.50%	66.50%	69.50%	72.50%	75.50%
A1	75.00%	Data	84.19%	86.08%	86.91%	87.34%	85.74%
A2	2008	Target>=	62.00%	64.00%	66.00%	68.00%	70.00%
A2	31.00%	Data	69.75%	71.18%	78.90%	77.56%	72.78%
B1	2008	Target>=	51.50%	56.50%	61.50%	66.50%	71.50%
B1	71.00%	Data	72.02%	69.61%	74.48%	74.29%	69.13%
B2	2008	Target>=	43.00%	45.00%	47.00%	49.00%	51.00%
B2	36.00%	Data	60.50%	55.70%	64.35%	63.93%	57.59%
C1	2008	Target>=	68.50%	71.50%	74.50%	77.50%	80.50%
C1	80.00%	Data	80.90%	81.04%	79.54%	84.96%	80.93%
C2	2008	Target>=	67.00%	69.00%	71.00%	73.00%	75.00%
C2	44.00%	Data	78.65%	76.56%	74.68%	80.56%	78.96%

#### Targets

FFY	2019
Target A1>=	85.00%
Target A2>=	72.00%
Target B1>=	71.50%
Target B2>=	57.00%
Target C1>=	80.50%
Target C2>=	75.00%

#### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

##### Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

1,081

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	7	1.06%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	82	12.44%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	105	15.93%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	343	52.05%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	122	18.51%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who	448	537	85.74%	85.00%	83.43%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program							
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	465	659	72.78%	72.00%	70.56%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable**

The data for FFY 2019 is slightly lower than FFY 2018. We have engaged with the Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA) center and the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy) through two phone calls to discuss child outcomes. We will continue to work with the centers to disaggregate the data to see trends in the percent of the population that is Medicaid eligible, determine if there is an increase in the percent of children coming from geographical areas where families are experiencing more risk factors and compare Medicaid to Not-Medicaid on all indicators to see what the gaps are. We do expect to stabilize improvement in the future. We will focus our attention on setting appropriate targets for the next 6 years

**Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable**

The data for FFY 2019 is slightly lower than FFY 2018. We have engaged with the Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA) center and the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy) through two phone calls to discuss child outcomes. We will continue to work with the centers to disaggregate the data to see trends in the percent of the population that is Medicaid eligible, determine if there is an increase in the percent of children coming from geographical areas where families are experiencing more risk factors and compare Medicaid to Not-Medicaid on all indicators to see what the gaps are. We do expect to stabilize improvement in the future. We will focus our attention on setting appropriate targets for the next 6 years

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	5	0.76%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	192	29.14%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	94	14.26%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	317	48.10%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	51	7.74%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	411	608	69.13%	71.50%	67.60%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	368	659	57.59%	57.00%	55.84%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable**

The data for FFY 2019 is slightly lower than FFY 2018. We have engaged with the Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA) center and the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy) through two phone calls to discuss child outcomes. We will continue to work with the centers to disaggregate the data to see trends in the percent of the population that is Medicaid eligible, determine if there is an increase in the percent of children coming from geographical areas where families are experiencing more risk factors and compare Medicaid to Not-Medicaid on all indicators to see what the gaps are. We do expect to stabilize improvement in the future. We will focus our attention on setting appropriate targets for the next 6 years.

**Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable**

The data for FFY 2019 is slightly lower than FFY 2018. We have engaged with the Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA) center and the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy) through two phone calls to discuss child outcomes. We will continue to work with the centers to disaggregate the data to see trends in the percent of the population that is Medicaid eligible, determine if there is an increase in the percent of children coming from geographical areas where families are experiencing more risk factors and compare Medicaid to Not-Medicaid on all indicators to see what the gaps are. We do expect to stabilize improvement in the future. We will focus our attention on setting appropriate targets for the next 6 years

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	5	0.76%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	90	13.66%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	52	7.89%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	302	45.83%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	210	31.87%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	354	449	80.93%	80.50%	78.84%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	512	659	78.96%	75.00%	77.69%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable**

The data for FFY 2019 is slightly lower than FFY 2018. We have engaged with the Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA) center and the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy) through two phone calls to discuss child outcomes. We will continue to work with the centers to disaggregate the data to see trends in the percent of the population that is Medicaid eligible, determine if there is an increase in the percent of children coming from geographical areas where families are experiencing more risk factors and compare Medicaid to Not-Medicaid on all indicators to see what the gaps are. We do expect to stabilize improvement in the future. We will focus our attention on setting appropriate targets for the next 6 years

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

Question	Number
The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's part C exiting 618 data	1,081
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.	306

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

NO

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

The District utilized the Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System for Infants and Children interactive (AEPSi) to capture the entry and exit data for children participating in early intervention. The AEPSi is a curriculum-based assessment used to determine progress towards developmental and IFSP goals. The system is designed to provide OSEP child outcomes information based on a child's progress. AEPSi uses empirically derived cutoff scores to determine if a child is typically developing or has a delay. If a child's AEPSi score is above the cutoff, the child is determined as not having delayed development and is performing at the level of same-age peers. AEPSi was aligned with OSEP Indicator #3 in the fall of 2005, and the crosswalk was validated in Jan. 2006. The crosswalk was again validated in July 2010 and minor modifications were made. Data analysis conducted with Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) in 2010 allowed the AEPSi test scores to be empirically aligned with the ECO 7-point Summary Form. This research helps ensure that the ECO Summary Form generated by AEPSi is accurate and valid.

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

Child outcomes exit data were collected on children for FFY 2019. The following process was used to complete data collection and analysis for child outcome determinations:

The District utilized the scores that were collected for children through the AEPSi which calculates the OSEP categories. Data were collected only if infants and toddlers received early intervention services for six months or longer. The entry AEPSi is completed by the initial evaluation provider and the exit AEPSi is completed by the child's provider no more than 60 days prior to the child's exit from the program. The initial evaluation and assessment

teams administer the entry assessment with the family. One of the interventionists and the family administer the assessment every six months thereafter. Both the interventionist and the service coordinator discuss with the family the importance of the exit assessment. Prior written notice for the assessment is provided to the family in advance of the assessment. The family signs consent for the assessment and the family participates during the assessment. The service coordinator also provides the family with a copy of their "Child Progress Record", which is a visual record of the child's accomplishments, current targets and future goals/objects. This comparative report can also visually depict the growth in development through changes in coloring/shading on the report, a darker shade for the entry data and a lighter shade showing the growth and forward movement documented by the exit assessment.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

As of October 1, 2020 all providers must complete the interrater reliability module in the AEPS. This will help affirm that providers are adequately trained to assess the child indicators. This indicator is very important as it is the essence of the Part C program, to improve outcomes for infants and toddlers.

**3 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3 - OSEP Response**

**3 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 4: Family Involvement

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 4 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2006	Target>=	92.70%	92.80%	92.90%	93.00%	93.10%
A	88.00%	Data	95.20%	92.02%	97.09%	97.25%	97.92%
B	2006	Target>=	88.10%	88.20%	88.30%	88.40%	88.50%
B	85.00%	Data	96.40%	92.02%	97.09%	97.75%	96.67%
C	2006	Target>=	83.10%	83.20%	83.30%	83.40%	83.50%
C	78.00%	Data	95.80%	96.93%	95.75%	97.75%	99.58%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target A>=	95.00%
Target B>=	95.00%
Target C>=	95.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input



**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	1,000
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	442
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	414
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	440
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	410
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	435
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	426
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	439

Measure	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2)	97.92%	95.00%	94.09%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2)	96.67%	95.00%	94.25%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2)	99.58%	95.00%	97.04%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for part A slippage, if applicable**

There was slippage however the responses for this year (442) were significantly larger than last years responses (240). Possibly having a broader population respond more accurately reflects families opinions.

**Provide reasons for part B slippage, if applicable**

There was slippage however the responses for this year (442) were significantly larger than last years responses (240). Possibly having a broader population respond more accurately reflects families opinions.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

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

Race/Ethnicity between the Survey and Part C

1.43 % of Asian families responded to the survey compared to 4.07 % were in Part C. 51.12 % of Black or African American families responded to the survey compared to 45.48% were in Part C. This reflects a strong increase over FFY 2018 survey which had 37.50% responded. We are pleased with the progress. 17.48 % of Hispanic/Latino families responded to the survey compared to 20.14% were in Part C. 22.29% of White families responded to the survey compared to 28.28% were in Part C.

\*Other 7.66 7.70

\*Includes Native Hawaiian, American Indian, other and two or more races

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

In FFY 18, OSSE used an online survey, but the response rate was 22 percent and respondents were not representative. For FFY 19 OSSE used the same online survey but also had the service coordinators work with families to complete the surveys at six-month reviews and annual reviews if they had not completed the survey with a tablet. This approach increased the FFY 19 response rate to 44 percent and resulted in a more representative pool of respondents. We think the personal relationship service coordinators have with families increased our response rate and representativeness.

#### **4 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2019 response data are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program , and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the population.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

#### **4 - OSEP Response**

#### **4 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

## 5 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2012	0.55%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	0.65%	0.70%	0.75%	0.80%	0.85%
Data	0.99%	1.40%	1.11%	1.17%	1.37%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	1.25%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/08/2020	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	139
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/25/2020	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	9,552

### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
139	9,552	1.37%	1.25%	1.46%	Met Target	No Slippage

### Compare your results to the national data

The national data for birth to one infant and toddlers is 1.37% and the District of Columbia is 1.46%. We are above the national data.

### Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

## 5 - Required Actions

## Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

## 6 - Indicator Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	1.68%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	3.00%	3.50%	4.00%	4.50%	5.00%
Data	2.40%	2.95%	2.97%	2.92%	3.72%

#### Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	3.48%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/08/2020	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	979
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/25/2020	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	27,800

#### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
979	27,800	3.72%	3.48%	3.52%	Met Target	No Slippage

#### Compare your results to the national data

The national average is 3.70% and the District of Columbia's was 3.52%. Although we did meet our target we did decrease from FFY 2018.

#### Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

## 6 - Required Actions

## Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

#### Instructions

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

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

## 7 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	60.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	96.50%	96.70%	90.12%	94.97%	98.06%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
92	191	98.06%	100%	95.29%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

### Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Due to moving to telehealth service delivery there was a learning curve for some staff to utilize the platforms which caused some delays.

### 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.

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

State database

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

The District of Columbia used 4th quarter from FFY2019 (April 1, 2020- June 30, 2020).

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

Clearly the 4th quarter reporting period April 1, 2020 through June 30, 2020 was different due to the challenges to the unprecedented pandemic. We believe the quarter was representative as could be expected given the implementation of new procedures to follow CDC guidance. We do believe the data is accurate and reliable.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

A drop down menu captures reason for delay such as family delay, evaluation delay or service coordinator delay. All instances of exceptional family circumstances were reviewed through a record review to verify that documentation was available to support family delay. While FFY 18 data reflected less than 100 percent compliance for children with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline for the reporting period, no findings were issued because correction according to federal requirements was verified before a finding was issued. Upon record reviews conducted for those children it was verified that correction had occurred prior to issuance of findings. All children with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted during the reporting period did have an IFSP developed although late and not within the 45-day timeline. In addition, for prong two of verification, the state did another review of subsequent data through a review of sample records which verified that all children in the new sample had an IFSP developed within the 45 day timeline.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

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

**7 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**7 - OSEP Response****7 - Required Actions**

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

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

## Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

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

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

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

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

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

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

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 8A - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	80.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	88.10%	86.27%	100.00%	94.40%	100.00%



**Targets**

FFY	2019
Target	100%

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
204	204	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).**

Fourth quarter April 1, 2020 - June 30, 2020

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

Clearly the 4th quarter reporting period April 1, 2020 through June 30, 2020 was different due to the challenges of the unprecedented pandemic. We believe the quarter was as representative as could be expected given the implementation of new procedures to follow CDC guidance. We do believe the data is accurate and reliable.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

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

**8A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**8A - OSEP Response**

**8A - Required Actions**

## Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

- 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;
- 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
- 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

- 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.
- 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.
- 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 timely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 8B - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2019
Target	100%

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

YES

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
204	204	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Number of parents who opted out**

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

0

**Describe the method used to collect these data**

Data were collected from the State database on a monthly basis. The District utilized the fourth quarter of FFY 2019 (April 1, 2020 - June 30, 2020) to complete a compliance review for this indicator.

The following steps were taken to complete data collection and analysis for this indicator:

The database was used for identifying all children who would be turning three during the reporting period.

The Strong Start database produces a spreadsheet of all children potentially eligible for Part B services between the ages of 2 years 6 months and 3 years of age.

On a monthly basis, an email is sent to the local education agency (LEA) of record and the State education agency (SEA) to inform them that the list of children potentially eligible for Part B is available. The database records the date and time the list is accessed by the LEA and SEA as confirmation of receipt of the list.

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

YES

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

YES

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

State database

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

Fourth quarter April 1, 2020 - June 30, 2020

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

Clearly the 4th quarter reporting period April 1, 2020 through June 30, 2020 was different due to the challenges of the unprecedented pandemic. We believe the quarter was as representative as could be expected given the implementation of new procedures to follow CDC guidance. We do believe the data is accurate and reliable.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

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

**8B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**8B - OSEP Response**

**8B - Required Actions**

## Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

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

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

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

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

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 8C - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	88.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	94.94%	91.37%	100.00%	90.32%	93.98%

**Targets**

FFY	2019
Target	100%

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
157	173	93.98%	100%	93.64%	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.

0

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties 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.

5

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).

April 1, 2020 through June 30, 2020

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

Clearly the 4th quarter reporting period April 1, 2020 through June 30, 2020 was different due to the challenges of the unprecedented pandemic. We believe the quarter was as representative as could be expected given the implementation of , not more new procedures to follow CDC guidance. We do believe the data is accurate and reliable.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

This data for exceptional family circumstances was gathered from the state database through a dropdown menu. It was then verified through a record review that documentation supported it. System delays were due to transition meeting occurring outside of the timelines.

While FFY 18 data reflected less than 100 percent compliance for children whom the Lead Agency conducted a transition meeting 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. No findings were issued because correction according to federal requirements was verified before a finding was issued. Upon record reviews conducted for those children it was verified that correction had occurred prior to issuance of findings. All children who were potentially eligible for a transition conference during the reporting period did have a transition conference although late and not within the 90 day timeline.

In addition, for prong two of verification, the state did another review of subsequent data through a review of sample records which verified that all children in the new sample had a transition conference within the 90 day timeline.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

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

## **8C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

## **8C - OSEP Response**

### **8C - Required Actions**

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

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

## Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 9 - Indicator Data

#### Not Applicable

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Select yes to use target ranges.**

Target Range not used

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

NO

#### Prepopulated Data

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

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data

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

#### Targets

FFY	2019
Target>=	

#### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data



3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0.00%			N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**9 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**9 - OSEP Response**

The District of Columbia reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2019. The District of Columbia is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

**9 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 10: Mediation

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 10 - Indicator Data

#### Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

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

NO

#### Prepopulated Data

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

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target>=					
Data					

#### Targets

FFY	2019
Target>=	

#### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

### 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

### 10 - OSEP Response

The District of Columbia reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2019. The District of Columbia is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

### 10 - Required Actions

## Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan – Part C SSIP Indicator



FFY19\_SSSIP\_PDF\_DC  
Part C Final.pdf

## **Certification**

### **Instructions**

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

### **Certify**

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

### **Select the certifier's role**

Designated Lead Agency Director

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

### **Name:**

Allan Phillips

### **Title:**

Special Assistant, Part C

### **Email:**

allan.phillips@dc.gov

### **Phone:**

202-412-7593

### **Submitted on:**

04/26/21 9:30:21 AM

## ED Attachments



DC-C-Dispute-Resolu  
tion-2019-20.pdf



DC-2021DataRubricP  
artC.xlsx



DC-resultsmatrix-202  
1c.pdf