

PR
Part C

FFY2015
State Performance Plan /
Annual Performance Report

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

Executive Summary:

During FFY 2015 - 2016 the Puerto Rico Early Intervention Program made substantial efforts to strengthen each one of the components required under the Part C of IDEA and to improve child and family outcomes. The Puerto Rico Part C uses a single line of responsibility for the Program: the Part C Coordinator, responsible for overseeing all the program activities and accountability; the Program Evaluator responsible for carrying out evaluation activities; the Data Manager in charge of collecting and analyzing all the data from regional offices, and a child development consultant to guarantee an appropriate implementation of the procedures and routine based strategies.

The Puerto Rico Early Intervention Program developed and started the implementation of the second phase of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). As part of the SSIP process, the state program selected three priorities to work with: personnel development, family engagement and monitoring. In terms of personnel development, the program started a collaboration with the University of Puerto Rico LEND/UCEDD to start an intensive training schedule for service coordinators and service providers on Part C regulations, family centered and routine based services, coaching, among other topics. The program is also receiving intensive technical assistance in personnel development from the Early Childhood Personnel Center (ECPC) of the University of Connecticut (UCONN).

In terms of family engagement, the program strengthened relationship with the Puerto Rico Parent Training and Information Center (APNI Spanish Acronym) and as a result, a representative of APNI is now part of the ECPC leaders group. Special efforts have been made to increase participation of families in the State Interagency Coordination Council meetings and other program activities. The Part C Coordinator is participating in NCSI collaborative on family engagement and results together with the Puerto Rico parent training and information program director. Participation in the collaborative is the first step towards the identification and implementation of Parents Leaders Groups for Early Intervention. Results from the indicators 4a, 4b & 4c: *Family Outcomes* survey, completed by 822 families, show that 96.9% reported that early intervention services helped them know their rights; 96.5% reported that early intervention services helped them communicate their child needs, and 98% of the participant families indicated that early intervention services helped them help their child develop and learn.

Finally, in terms of monitoring, during the last fiscal year, the program monitoring unit focused on increasing the number of files selected and revised for COS analysis. This effort increased the percentage of children outcomes data reported from FFY 2013-2014 to FFY 2014 - 2015 from 16% to a 62.4% when compared to the number of children exiting the Program in the Exiting Data report. Our target for FFY 2015 - 2016 was to exceed the 70% of COSF revisions to comply with the Data Completeness criterion on the Results Matrix for the States Determination Letters. The number of supervision visits to the regions almost doubled in comparison with the previous reporting period. The Monitoring Manual is in revision and it is expected to be finished and distributed during the next quarter of this FY.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

General Supervision System:

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

The lead agency for Puerto Rico Part C is the Puerto Rico Department of Health (PRDOH). The program is located under the Maternal, Adolescent, and Child Division and has seven regional offices island-wide. Regional staff is led by a regional early intervention supervisor who is responsible for the supervision of intake and service coordinators, service providers and other private or community based corporations that provide services to eligible children.

At the central office, Puerto Rico Part C uses a single line of responsibility for the Program: the Part C Coordinator, responsible for overseeing all the program activities and accountability, a Program Evaluator responsible for carrying out evaluation activities, data gathering and improvement planning, a Data Manager that is in charge of collecting and analyzing all the data from regional offices to guarantee data completion for accountability and compliance with all IDEA Part C regulations. As part of the accountability process, the Supervision and Monitoring Unit (SMU) performs regular on-site visits to all early intervention regional programs. In the regional site visits, the monitoring staff performs chart revisions, process observations and provides guidance to the regional staff based on monitoring results and in the analysis of data submitted by the regional supervisors on an ongoing basis.

Findings of data analysis, site visits and periodic reports are discussed in the supervisors' monthly meetings to timely address noncompliance risks or special situations that may affect child results. Service providers are monitored using OSEP results indicators data, monthly reports, progress notes, and by the analysis of financial data such as professional services invoices. If a correction action is needed, instructions for correction are provided using official memos. Puerto Rico Early Intervention Program corrects findings of noncompliance within a year of notification, consistent with OSEP memo 09-02.

APR results (report version and a family friendly version) are available for public comment in the Puerto Rico Department of Health website and also are available in the regional offices bulletin boards. The following link provide access to the APR report in its two versions: <http://www.salud.gov.pr/Dept-de-Salud/Pages/Unidades-Operacionales/Secretaria-Auxiliar-de-Salud-Familiar-y-Servicios-Integrados/Division-Madres-Ninos-y-Adolescentes.aspx#temprana>.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Technical Assistance System:

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

Technical assistance for the program is led by a consultant who is a specialist in developmental pediatrics. The consultant works closely with the Supervision and Monitoring Unit and addresses identified issues related with early intervention processes, development of functional outcomes, eligibility determinations and ongoing assessments. Trainings are tailored to regions according to monitoring findings. Tools developed by NCSI, ECTA/DaSy and the ECO Center are used in the TA system and frequently the UPR/UCEDD/LEND program provides feedback as well. Some of the training topics covered by the TA leader include: child assessment, evaluation, eligibility criteria, child outcomes measurement, and functional outcomes. The consultant has expertise in child development and has knowledge of the EI law, norms and procedures, ECTA guidelines and Child Outcomes measurement.

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

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 PR EIP has a Developmental Pediatrician on board in charge of training providers in the delivery of services in Natural Environments (NE) to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. Trainings are provided on-site in each EI regional Programs. Supervisors meet monthly with the Part C coordinator to discuss providers' performance in NE, appropriate COSF ratings, and the proper use of the decision tree to improve outcomes for children and families. The Developmental Pediatrician gathers their input and coordinates meetings at the regional levels to provide technical assistance, and re-training to ensure that providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. During the past fiscal year and as part of the State Systemic Improvement Plan, PR EIP established an agreement with the Puerto Rico University of Puerto Rico UCEDD/LEND program to serve as the early intervention system scientific partner. With this collaboration, the system personnel will receive the latest information in evidence based practices that can be translated in strategies to ensure high quality services for the children and families. The first activity performed in partnership with the UPR/UCEDD/LEND was a workshop on Reflexive Participation in working with families. The workshop was offered by an Indiana University LEND Program faculty member and was sponsored by the University of Puerto Rico. Another important activity performed towards the improvement of the CSPD was the development of a team of early childhood leaders that are receiving intensive technical assistance by the University of Connecticut Early Childhood Personnel Center (ECPC). The group includes representatives of early intervention, Early Childhood, Special Education Program, the governor's Council for Early Childhood, Early Head Start/Head Start, and other partners. The goal of the ECPC leaders group is to improve and implement a standard uniform personnel development system across the different agencies that provide services to this population.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part C results indicators

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

The Puerto Rico State Interagency Coordination Council (SICC) is the group that brings together the main PR EIS stakeholders. During 2016, the SICC worked together in 6 meetings to provide input on issues regarding SSIP, compliance with IDEA requirements and other collaboration activities. As in the previous year, the January meeting is to analyze and discuss all the information included in the APR to be submitted at February 1st. During the following meetings, the SICC made an assessment of the system infrastructure to identify possible barriers that can affect the implementation of the identified improvement strategies. The Puerto Rico stakeholder group is composed of representatives of Developmental Delays Institute (PR UCEDD/LEND), the Families and Children's Affairs Administration, the Association of Parents of Children with Disabilities, the Health Services Administration, the Mental Health Services Administration, Health Insurance Commissioner, Centro Margarita (Service CBO), NY Founding, the Office of the Ombudsman for Persons with Disabilities, SER de Puerto Rico (Service CBO), Medicaid, Department of Education, and Army Educational & Developmental Intervention Services.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2013 performance of each EIS Program or Provider 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 2013 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2013 APR in 2015, is available.

Puerto Rico will make its FFY 2015 APR available through public means, including posting on the website of the Puerto Rico Department of Health and distribution through public agencies, including the Puerto Rico Department of Education, Early Head Start/Head Start Programs, Department of the Family, Office of the Ombudsman for Persons with Disabilities, Developmental Disabilities Council, University Center of Excellence in Developmental Disabilities, and the Parents Training Center. Puerto Rico Annual Performance Report will be available in English and a detailed document with the results for Indicators one (1) through eight (8) by Early Intervention Programs (EIP) compared to overall Puerto Rico performance will be developed in Spanish and posted on the Department of Health website (*Public Reporting for FFY 2013*): <http://www.salud.gov.pr/Dept-de-Salud/Pages/Unidades-Operacionales/Secretaria-Auxiliar-de-Salud-Familiar-y-Servicios-Integrados/Division-Madres-Ninos-y-Adolescentes.aspx#temprana>.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 1: Timely provision of services**

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		80.50%	93.00%	93.70%	96.00%	98.20%	97.10%	97.00%	99.30%	96.69%	99.37%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2015 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
180	186	99.37%	100%	99.46%

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.

5

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

- State monitoring
- State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

Puerto Rico Part C team selected the records for the evaluation of Indicator 1 according to the date of the last IFSP recorded in the EI Data System. The inclusion criterion was that an IFSP had to be developed between July 1st, 2015 and June 30th, 2016. All (7) seven EI programs in Puerto Rico were included for data collection. Each one of the regional supervisors was required to hand in a list of records for the selection of a random sample. From that list, records were chosen systematically on an interval given by the ratio of total records in the sampling frame and the number of records of each program. The first record was chosen using a random number between 1 and the selection interval number, while the next record was identified using that selection interval. During the past year, the Monitoring and Supervision Unit staff made an effort to increase the sample of charts to be monitored, to assure an appropriate implementation of procedures and also, an appropriate correction of non-compliance issues. For all regional programs, data were collected through onsite monitoring activities conducted by the SMU, explaining all the process and its importance to the regional supervisors. After the on-site data collection is made, the SMU performs the analysis and, if necessary, calls the regional supervisors for further information and clarifications. Documented exceptional family circumstances that prevented a timely provision of services are included in the numerator and denominator for calculating the data.

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

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

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Findings of noncompliance are included in corrective plans that regional supervisors submit to the Supervision and Monitoring Unit and in direct technical assistance. The reasons for the delay in service provision were included as topics discussed with the regional supervisors in their monthly meetings to strengthen compliance with the indicator. The State has verified that the regional programs that reported events of noncompliance for FFY 2014, did not have findings in FFY 2015.

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

The State verified that both cases of noncompliance were corrected. Both regional programs completed the action required (initiation of services) before the children were no longer in the jurisdiction of the regional program.

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments**

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			99.20%	99.30%	99.40%	99.50%	99.50%	99.70%	99.70%	99.81%	99.81%
Data		99.70%	99.70%	99.90%	99.00%	99.80%	99.90%	100%	98.40%	99.81%	99.92%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	99.82%	99.82%	99.83%	99.83%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders plays an important role in the identification of settings that promote child development. In those cases where the child needs to be placed in a more appropriate setting, the agencies that are part of the SICC identify possibilities and those alternatives are provided to the families. During the past FY, all of EI participants (100%) received services in the NE.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	3,236	3238
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	3,238	3238

Explanation of Alternate Data

FFY 2015 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
3,238	3,238	99.92%	99.82%	100%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

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)

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)? **No**

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2011	Target ≥						54.40%	54.50%	54.50%	42.00%	43.79%	43.80%
		Data					54.40%	45.20%	33.30%	39.40%	39.20%	43.79%	65.68%
A2	2011	Target ≥						68.30%	68.40%	68.50%	55.00%	56.99%	57.00%
		Data					68.30%	53.50%	43.80%	53.90%	46.50%	56.99%	76.24%
B1	2011	Target ≥						47.90%	48.00%	48.70%	36.00%	46.63%	46.64%
		Data					47.90%	39.00%	43.80%	32.50%	31.30%	46.63%	71.10%
B2	2011	Target ≥						33.50%	33.60%	33.70%	22.00%	34.68%	34.69%
		Data					33.50%	21.30%	16.60%	18.70%	12.60%	34.68%	52.45%
C1	2011	Target ≥						40.20%	40.30%	40.40%	34.00%	38.02%	38.03%
		Data					40.20%	35.90%	32.40%	28.30%	29.00%	38.02%	63.10%
C2	2011	Target ≥						50.90%	51.00%	51.10%	45.00%	51.35%	51.36%
		Data					50.90%	41.30%	41.70%	43.90%	37.70%	51.35%	71.74%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	43.81%	43.82%	43.83%	43.84%
Target A2 ≥	57.01%	57.02%	57.03%	57.04%
Target B1 ≥	46.65%	46.66%	46.67%	46.68%
Target B2 ≥	34.70%	34.71%	34.72%	34.73%
Target C1 ≥	38.04%	38.05%	38.06%	38.07%
Target C2 ≥	51.37%	51.38%	51.39%	51.40%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State explained to stakeholders about data analysis based on past year's results and they are conscious of the EIP efforts to improve in the analysis and revision of COS data. This effort increased the percentage of children outcomes data reported from FFY 2013-2014 to FFY 2014 – 2015 from 16% to a 62.4% when compared to the number of children exiting the Program in the Exiting Data report. Our target for FFY 2015 – 2016 was to exceed the 70% of COSF revisions to comply with the Data Completeness criterion on the Results Matrix for the States Determination Letters. Improvement in child and family outcomes is a goal of the SSIP and the stakeholders are partners with EIP staff in the identification and implementation of strategies that will help the program to improve results.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	2298.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	46.00	2.00%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	264.00	11.49%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	89.00	3.87%

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	458.00	19.93%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1441.00	62.71%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	547.00	857.00	65.68%	43.81%	63.83%
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	1899.00	2298.00	76.24%	57.01%	82.64%

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	55.00	2.39%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	514.00	22.37%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	442.00	19.23%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1139.00	49.56%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	148.00	6.44%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	1581.00	2150.00	71.10%	46.65%	73.53%
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	1287.00	2298.00	52.45%	34.70%	56.01%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	47.00	2.05%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	356.00	15.49%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	104.00	4.53%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	531.00	23.11%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1260.00	54.83%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	635.00	1038.00	63.10%	38.04%	61.18%
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	1791.00	2298.00	71.74%	51.37%	77.94%

Was sampling used? No

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

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4: Family Involvement**

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2006	Target ≥					85.90%	86.90%	87.90%	88.00%	90.10%	90.46%	90.47%
		Data			60.00%	87.00%	97.70%	94.00%	96.00%	95.60%	92.92%	90.46%	96.23%
B	2006	Target ≥					83.20%	84.20%	85.20%	85.30%	91.10%	89.06%	89.07%
		Data			57.00%	86.00%	96.20%	93.40%	95.00%	95.00%	92.41%	89.06%	96.23%
C	2006	Target ≥					89.20%	90.20%	91.20%	91.30%	93.20%	94.39%	94.40%
		Data			79.00%	91.00%	98.90%	95.80%	97.00%	98.00%	95.95%	94.39%	98.12%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	90.48%	90.49%	90.50%	94.51%
Target B ≥	89.08%	89.09%	89.10%	89.11%
Target C ≥	94.41%	94.42%	94.43%	94.44%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Previous comments of the stakeholders included the revision of the family survey, the identification of the best times for the survey distribution and a selection criteria for the families to be surveyed.

The EI program team decided to make the survey when the child exit the program in order to collect information of families whose children met their goals or make the transition to Part B. This procedure will allow the program to obtain information of a more diverse group of families.

The suggestion of the SICC members to establish a participation selection criteria was accepted and currently the survey is distributed to every family that have at least 6 months of participation in the program.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent families participating in Part C	822.00
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	797.00
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	822.00
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	794.00
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	822.00
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	809.00
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	822.00

	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	96.23%	90.48%	96.96%

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	96.23%	89.08%	96.59%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	98.12%	94.41%	98.42%

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

Using a 22 item scale of NCSEAM Survey this State has collected the data through face-to-face interviews or through a self-administered questionnaire for families who opted to complete the survey anonymously.

Every family with a child receiving Part C services for at least six (6) months at the IFSP revision meeting had the opportunity to partake in the survey. The family survey response group represents the population of children that were active in the Early Intervention Program (EIP) from July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016 in every local program, by age group, eligibility criteria, and by geographic location. Surveys were returned from 7 EIPs throughout Puerto Rico. In total, 822 surveys were returned.

Puerto Rico has selected to apply the standards recommended by NCSEAM as a way of obtaining the percent to be reported for Indicators 4a, 4b, and 4c. To establish a recommended standard, NCSEAM convened a group of nationally representative stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, state directors of special education, state early intervention coordinators, district and program personnel, advocates, attorneys, and community representatives. Participants were invited to examine a set of items from the IFS, laid out in their calibration order. The items towards the bottom of the scale, having lower calibrations, are items that families tend to agree with most.

The items towards the top of the scale, having higher calibrations, are items that families tend to agree with least. Because of the robust structure of the scale, a respondent who agrees with a given statement will have a very high likelihood of agreeing, or agreeing even more strongly, with all the items below it on the scale.

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? No

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			0.60%	0.70%	0.50%	0.55%	0.60%	0.61%	0.62%	0.48%	0.49%
Data		0.56%	0.61%	0.63%	0.55%	0.57%	0.59%	0.52%	0.40%	0.49%	0.45%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	0.51%	0.53%	0.55%	0.57%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During the last FY, the EIP was leading the implementation of Law #200 of 2014. This law requires the PR Department of Health to promote EI services in hospitals, clinics, and service providers offices. A strategic plan was developed for the implementation of the Law and the EI program has an action plan to disseminate information among health care facilities y service agencies.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	221	null
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2015	6/30/2016	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	null	33,548

Explanation of Alternate Data

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
221	33,548	0.45%	0.51%	0.66%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			2.05%	2.10%	2.15%	2.20%	2.25%	2.26%	2.35%	3.08%	3.09%
Data		2.56%	2.85%	3.25%	3.43%	3.61%	3.86%	3.78%	2.98%	3.09%	3.29%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	3.10%	3.11%	3.12%	3.13%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During the last FY, the EIP was leading the implementation of Law #200 of 2014. This law requires the PR Department of Health to promote EI services in hospitals, clinics, and service providers offices. A strategic plan was developed for the implementation of the Law and the EI program has an action plan to disseminate information among health care facilities y service agencies.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	3,238	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2015	6/30/2016	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	null	101844

Explanation of Alternate Data

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
3,238	101,844	3.29%	3.10%	3.18%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 7: 45-day timeline**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		86.80%	97.40%	98.40%	93.40%	100%	100%	100%	89.30%	97.35%	99.37%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2015 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
154	158	99.37%	100%	98.73%

<p>Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>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.</i></p>	2
---	---

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

- State monitoring
- State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

Puerto Rico Part C team selected the records for the evaluation of Indicator 1 according to the date when the referral was received. The inclusion criterion was that the referral had to be received between July 1st, 2015 and June 30th, 2016. All (7) seven EI programs in Puerto Rico were included for data collection. Each one of the regional supervisors was required to hand in a list of records for the selection of a random sample. From that list, records were chosen systematically on an interval given by the ratio of total records in the sampling frame and the number of records of each program. The first record was chosen using a random number between 1 and the selection interval number, while the next record was identified using that selection interval. During the past year, the Monitoring and Supervision Unit staff made an effort to increase the sample of charts to be monitored, to assure an appropriate implementation of procedures and also, an appropriate correction of non-compliance issues. For all regional programs, data were collected through onsite monitoring activities conducted by the SMU, explaining all the process and its importance to the regional supervisors. After the on-site data collection is made, the SMU performs the analysis and, if necessary, calls the regional supervisors for further information and clarifications. Documented exceptional family circumstances that prevented a timely provision of services are included in the numerator and denominator for calculating the data.

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

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

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Findings of noncompliance are included in corrective plans that regional supervisors submit to the Supervision and Monitoring Unit and in direct technical assistance. The reasons for the delay in service provision were included as topics discussed with the regional supervisors in their monthly meetings to strengthen compliance with the indicator. The State has verified that the regional programs that reported events of noncompliance for FFY 2014, did not have findings in FFY 2015.

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

The State verified that both cases of noncompliance were corrected. Both regional programs completed the action required: evaluation for eligibility determination, assessment and IFSP meeting.

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		96.10%	91.60%	100%	93.20%	98.60%	100%	100%	100%	97.53%	93.09%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Explanation of Alternate 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

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
107	116	93.09%	100%	93.97%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>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.</i>	2
--	---

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

- State monitoring
- State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

Puerto Rico Part C team selected the records for the evaluation of Indicator 8A according to the date transition steps were given to the families recorded in the EI Data System. The inclusion criteria were that the children's third birthday was between July 1st, 2015 and June 30th, 2016 and transition steps given to the families within that period. All (7) seven EI programs in Puerto Rico were included for data collection. Each one of the regional supervisors were required to hand in a list of records for the selection of a random sample. From that list, records were chosen systematically on an interval given by the ratio of total records in the sampling frame and the number of records of each program. The first record was chosen using a random number between 1 and the selection interval number, while the next record was identified using that selection interval. During the past fiscal year, the monitoring and supervision unit made an effort to increase the sample of charts to be monitored, to assure an appropriate implementation of procedures and also, correction of non-compliance issues. For all regional programs, data were collected through onsite monitoring activities conducted by the SMU, explaining all the process and its importance to the regional supervisors. After the on-site data collection is made, the SMU performs the analysis and, if necessary, calls the regional supervisors for further information and clarifications. Documented exceptional family circumstances that prevented a timely transitions steps and transition conference are included in the numerator and denominator for calculating the data.

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, *not including correction of findings*

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
15	15	null	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Findings of noncompliance are included in corrective plans that regional supervisors submit to the Supervision and Monitoring Unit and in direct technical assistance. The reasons for the delay in service provision were included as topics discussed with the regional supervisors in their monthly meetings to strengthen compliance with the indicator. The State has verified that the regional programs that reported events of noncompliance for FFY 2014, did not have findings in FFY 2015, or if they did, these decreased substantially.

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

The State verified that all cases of noncompliance were corrected. All regional programs completed the action required (developed IFSP with transition steps), unless the children were no longer within the jurisdiction of the regional program, which were 2 of the cases.

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		91.40%	99.00%	100%	100%	100%	98.40%	100%	100%	87.65%	90.32%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Explanation of Alternate Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

- Yes
- No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
114	116	90.32%	100%	98.28%

<p>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.</p>	0
---	---

Describe the method used to collect these data

Puerto Rico Part C team selected the records for the evaluation of Indicator 8A according to the date transition steps were given to the families recorded in the EI Data System. The inclusion criteria were that the children's third birthday was between July 1st, 2015 and June 30th, 2016 and transition steps given to the families within that period. All (7) seven EI programs in Puerto Rico were included for data collection. Each one of the regional supervisors were required to hand in a list of records for the selection of a random sample. From that list, records were chosen systematically on an interval given by the ratio of total records in the sampling frame and the number of records of each program. The first record was chosen using a random number between 1 and the selection interval number, while the next record was identified using that selection interval. During the past fiscal year, the monitoring and supervision unit made an effort to increase the sample of charts to be monitored, to assure an appropriate implementation of procedures and also, correction of non-compliance issues. For all regional programs, data were collected through onsite monitoring activities conducted by the SMU, explaining all the process and its importance to the regional supervisors. After the on-site data collection is made, the SMU performs the analysis and, if necessary, calls the regional supervisors for further information and clarifications. Documented exceptional family circumstances that prevented a timely transitions steps and transition conference are included in the numerator and denominator for calculating the data.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? Yes

Is the policy on file with the Department? Yes

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

- State monitoring
- State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

PR EI data system collects the basic information regarding services including transition planning. Part C team selected the records for the evaluation of Indicator 8B according to the date transition steps were given to the families recorded in the EI Data System. The inclusion criteria were that the children's third birthday was between July 1st, 2015 and June 30th, 2016 and transition steps given to the families within that period. All (7) seven EI programs in Puerto Rico were included for data collection.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
17	17	0	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Findings of noncompliance are included in corrective plans that regional supervisors submit to the Supervision and Monitoring Unit and in direct technical assistance. The reasons for the delay in service provision were included as topics discussed with the regional supervisors in their monthly meetings to strengthen compliance with the indicator. The State has verified that the regional programs that reported events of noncompliance for FFY 2014, did not have findings in FFY 2015, or if they did, these decreased substantially. 17 cases were identified in FFY and only 2 in FFY 2015.

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

The State verified that all cases of noncompliance were corrected. All regional programs completed the action required: notified SEA and LEA of toddler's potential eligibility.

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		64.20%	88.00%	99.60%	97.50%	100%	100%	100%	100%	97.53%	93.09%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Explanation of Alternate 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

Please explain

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
107	116	93.09%	100%	93.97%

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference <i>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.</i>	0
Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	2

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

- State monitoring
- State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

Puerto Rico Part C team selected the records for the evaluation of Indicator 8C according to the date transition steps were given to the families recorded in the EI Data System. The inclusion criteria were that the children's 1/30/2017

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

third birthday was between July 1st, 2015 and June 30th, 2016 and transition steps given to the families within that period. All (7) seven EI programs in Puerto Rico were included for data collection. Each one of the regional supervisors were required to hand in a list of records for the selection of a random sample. From that list, records were chosen systematically on an interval given by the ratio of total records in the sampling frame and the number of records of each program. The first record was chosen using a random number between 1 and the selection interval number, while the next record was identified using that selection interval. During the past fiscal year, the monitoring and supervision unit made an effort to increase the sample of charts to be monitored, to assure an appropriate implementation of procedures and also, correction of non-compliance issues. For all regional programs, data were collected through onsite monitoring activities conducted by the SMU, explaining all the process and its importance to the regional supervisors. After the on-site data collection is made, the SMU performs the analysis and, if necessary, calls the regional supervisors for further information and clarifications. Documented exceptional family circumstances that prevented a timely transitions steps and transition conference are included in the numerator and denominator for calculating the data.

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
15	15	0	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Findings of noncompliance are included in corrective plans that regional supervisors submit to the Supervision and Monitoring Unit and in direct technical assistance. The reasons for the delay in service provision were included as topics discussed with the regional supervisors in their monthly meetings to strengthen compliance with the indicator. The State has verified that the regional programs that reported events of noncompliance for FFY 2014, did not have findings in FFY 2015, or if they did, these decreased substantially.

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

The State verified that all cases of noncompliance were corrected. All regional programs completed the action required (conducted transition conference), unless the children were no longer within the jurisdiction of the regional program, which were 2 of the cases.

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions**

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)

Historical Data

Baseline Data:

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥											
Data											NA

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥				

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	n	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0	NA		

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 10: Mediation**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥											
Data					40.00%						

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥				

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	n
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	n	n
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1 Mediations held	n	n

Explanation of Alternate Data

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0	0			

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014	2015
Target		34.68%	34.69%
Data	34.68%	71.10%	

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	34.70%	34.71%	34.72%

Key:

Description of Measure

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Overview

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., EIS program and/or EIS provider, geographic region, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, etc.) As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in EIS programs and/or EIS providers to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and other early learning initiatives, such as Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge and the Home Visiting program and describe the extent that these new initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and Their Families

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child- or family-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increase the rate of growth in infants and toddlers demonstrating positive social-emotional skills) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increase the percentage reported under child outcome B under Indicator 3 of the SPP/APR (knowledge and skills) and increase the percentage trend reported for families under Indicator 4 (helping their child develop and learn)).

Statement

Description

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families. The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support EIS program and/or EIS provider implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified result(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build EIS program and/or EIS provider capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in EIS programs and/or EIS providers, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

 Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

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.

Selected: Designated by the Lead Agency Director to certify

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: Manuel I. Vargas-Bernal

Title: PR MCH Division Director

Email: mivargas@salud.pr.gov

Phone: 787-765-2929