

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:
Part C**

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

**For reporting on
FFY18**



PART C DUE February 3, 2020

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

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

Although Federal Fiscal Year 2018 was the year following the emergency caused by Hurricanes Irma and Maria in 2017, Puerto Rico kept making substantial efforts to improve child outcomes and comply with IDEA regulations. By the start of the FFY, Puerto Rico was still in recovery, with some areas still lacking electric power, displaced families in the island living in government shelters, while others made the decision to move to mainland US. The Commonwealth also dealt with austerity measures imposed by the Fiscal Board that have been ongoing since 2015. Still, the Puerto Rico Early Intervention Program implemented strategies to collect 100% of outcomes data and exceeded all targets established for indicators 3A - 3C on both summary statements. Puerto Rico is also reporting 100% on indicator 2, providing services to infants and toddlers with an IFSP for this FFY in their natural environments. Regarding family outcomes, Puerto Rico collected more data than in the previous year. A total of 781 questionnaires were returned, when compared with FFY 2017, and exceeded all targets as well.

On the other hand, Puerto Rico could not achieve 100% compliance on indicator 1 and is reporting a slight slippage with 94.93%. The territory did not meet indicator 7 target but this worsening of performance does not constitute slippage. The indicator areas that previously represented more challenges to the jurisdiction were indicators 8A, 8B, 8C, but this FFY PR met the 100% target for indicators 8A and 8C. Indicator 8B is still an area in need of improvement, with 10 events of non-compliance distributed in 3 regional programs. The EIP has been implementing strategies to improve the notification of potentially eligible children to Part B, including monthly projections of transitions to provide enough time for Part B and Part C regional staff to plan ahead to conduct transitions in a seamless way. These are proving to be successful, although 100% performance was not achieved, since substantial improvement was reported. For FFY 2017, 18 events of noncompliance were identified vs. 10 events for FFY 2018. The data reported were collected during monitoring site visit activities that are conducted at least once in a year in each of the regional programs. The Supervision and Monitoring Unit (SMU) conducts these activities to further analyze the data and calculate performance percentages. Other forms of data collection for the territory include monthly and quarterly reports sent to the SMU such as Child Count and COS data.

Puerto Rico continued collaboration and participation in the Puerto Rico partnership to optimize family support for families affected by Zika virus. The Early Intervention Program is part of the project that pursues to help families of children impacted by the virus to smoothly navigate the health care system to obtain the services needed for the child, and to be part of the decision making process. There are 3 partners in this initiative, which are the Department of Health MCH and early intervention programs sharing the leadership/coordination roles for the project, the Association of Spina Bifida and Hydrocephalus, that provided orientation and training to the affected families to motivate them to be part of the health decision making process and to educate service providers in how to provide family centered services, and the UPR LEND/UCEDD who are the leaders in technical assistance for services providers.

In terms of child find activities, the EIP has been doing several activities, with special attention to increase the proportion of eligible children with developmental delays with IFSP's (before 1 year of age, indicator 5). The activities included all regional teams promoting the EI services in Pediatric facilities, WIC offices, and other agencies. The state team also participated in educational activities developed by the Puerto Rico College of Physicians offered to pediatricians and general practitioners, and conferences for law and education students that explained IDEA C requirements, PREIP eligibility criteria and methods to submit a referral. Formal collaboration agreements were continued to be established with the University of Puerto Rico to provide education on child development to pediatrics residents and also, to be a practicum site for the early intervention academic certification of the UCEDD. For FFY 2018, although the State target was not met, substantial increase was observed.

The jurisdiction also continued to strengthen its capacity of improving the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development and coordinated training activities around coaching, family centered services, service coordination and other relevant subjects. Members of the SICC, regional supervisors, regional nurses and some selected service coordinators benefited from the activities. Also, in collaboration with the Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Program, 25 people, from regional supervisors, service coordinators and service providers from 4 regional programs were trained in the basics of sign language with special attention to daily early intervention program language in order to have trained personnel to support families with children with disabilities who have members that are deaf or hard of hearing. These activities are continuing throughout FFY 2019. Daily support for providers, coordinators and supervisors is provided by the SMU and the child development consultant through email, conference calls, monthly supervisor meetings and onsite trainings.

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 Department of Health (PRDoH). The Program is located under the Maternal, Child and Adolescent Health Division and has seven regional offices island-wide aligned with the seven health regions that shape the Department. The PREIP uses a single line of responsibility: the Part C Coordinator, the Evaluator and the Data Manager to ensure compliance with IDEA C regulations. The Coordinator is responsible for overseeing all the program's activities, for its accountability and also for maintaining and building new collaborations with other programs and agencies. The Program Evaluator designs, implements and leads all monitoring and evaluation activities, whereas the Data Manager alongside the Evaluator, collects and analyzes data from the regional offices to complete reports and for data-driven decision making. The Puerto Rico Early Intervention Program - Avanzando Juntos also has a Consultant on Child Development to ensure continuous support to service providers and, implementation of procedures and routine based strategies. Regional personnel is led by a regional supervisor who is responsible for the intake and service coordinators' supervision. The regional supervisor also facilitates the implementation of strategies to support children with disabilities and their families and improve their outcomes leading the intake and service coordinators. The Supervision and Monitoring Unit (SMU) comprised by the Evaluator and Data Manager, performs regular visits to the regional programs where technical assistance and monitoring activities are carried out. These activities include record review and guidance to the personnel based on monitoring results and data analysis from other reports submitted to the SMU on a regular basis. A data submission calendar is developed and shared with regional programs in order to ensure timely data submission, a component that is evaluated to issue local regional determinations. Monitoring activities to gather APR data occur once a year between August and September, after the fiscal year that is being evaluated ends. These are SMU on-site visits in which a random sample of records is selected for review and regional supervisors partake in the activities as part of the team. The Program Evaluator and Data Manager explain the reasons the SMU will issue a finding of non-compliance, if that is the case, and also what is expected of the program. This allows supervisors to design and implement strategies to

ensure compliance. Regular submission of COS and family outcomes data is also evaluated and the SMU regularly engages in data quality activities to ensure that the data are valid and reliable.

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 the child development 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, assessments and outcomes data. Trainings are tailored to regions according to monitoring findings and needs that are identified in monthly meetings. 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 and evaluation, eligibility criteria, child outcomes measurement, and functional outcomes. The consultant has expertise in child development and knowledge of the IDEA, norms, procedures, and regulations, ECTA guidelines and Child Outcomes measurement. Periodic conference calls with TA persons of NCSI and other TA centers are scheduled to discuss implementation of strategies to improve results and ensure high quality services.

In February 2019, personnel from NCSI and DaSy traveled to Puerto Rico to provide on-site training on the fundamentals of coaching, family-centered services and procedures, as well as spaces for case studying to provide feedback and strategies to improve.

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 child development consultant is the leader in charge of training service 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 Program or at the State, if the training involves more personnel that can benefit. Regional supervisors meet monthly with the Part C coordinator to discuss providers' performance in natural environments, COS ratings, and data collection methods such as the use of the decision tree to improve outcomes for children and families. The consultant gathers their input and coordinates meetings at the regional offices to provide technical assistance and continuous training to ensure that providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. As part of the State Systemic Improvement Plan, PR EIP established and has maintained 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 and in service training in evidence based practices that can be translated in strategies to ensure high quality services for the children and families. Another important activity performed towards the improvement of the CSPD was the continuation with the implementation 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. During FFY 2018 and as part of the implementation of the SSIP, EI personnel received extensive trainings in Family centered services, Coaching, Reflexive Supervision, Working with families in emergency situations, among other topics.

Stakeholder Involvement:

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

The Puerto Rico State Interagency Coordination Council (SICC) is the group that brings together the main PR EIS stakeholders. During FFY 2018-2019, the SICC worked together in 2 meetings to provide input on issues regarding, personnel development, SSIP, determination results, compliance with IDEA requirements and other collaboration activities. As in the previous year, the January meeting was to analyze and discuss all the information included in the APR to be submitted February 1st. During the following meeting, the SICC continued with its 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 (UPR 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 Foundling, 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. As part of their feedback to this year APR, the stakeholders suggested to start the discussions towards strengthening the child find infrastructure as well as rethinking strategies for increasing the number of questionnaires returned for indicator 4 - Family Outcomes. The work group was engaged in discussions around the differences between regional programs and their impacts on service delivery, data and results.

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

YES

Reporting to the Public:

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

APR results are available for public access in the Puerto Rico Department of Health website under Maternal, Child and Adolescent Health Division - Early Intervention Program and are also available in the regional offices bulletin boards. The following link provides access to the APR report: <http://www.salud.gov.pr/Dept-de-Salud/Documents/Public%20Reporting%20FFY%202017.pdf>

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Intro - OSEP Response

States were instructed to submit Phase III, Year Four, of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), indicator C-11, by April 1, 2020. The State provided the required information. The State provided a FFY 2019 target for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

Intro - 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 Five; (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.

Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

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

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

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	80.50%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	96.69%	99.37%	99.46%	100.00%	97.81%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
215	231	97.81%	100%	93.94%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Slippage is observed in this indicator due to a change in the procedures regarding the contracts of service providers. The SMU reviewed 231 records for indicator 1 and identified 16 events of non-compliance where services were delivered after the 30 day period that is permitted. Two cases were related to extraordinary family circumstances and 14 cases were due to a reason related to the Program. In all 14 events of non-compliance related to the Program, services were not provided in a timely manner due to processes regarding contract renewal for service providers. The PR EIP makes all efforts

to provide services on time, and started the procedures to contract the providers as per usual to guarantee that we have the personnel to comply with this at the start of the fiscal year. New procedures imposed to the Government agencies by the Fiscal Board delayed the processes of the lead agency to contract the personnel. This meant that some providers could not deliver the services for a period of three weeks in October 2018, until contracts were authorized. Families were impacted by this if their service provider worked for a corporation or a non-profit organization contracted by the lead agency to provide the services. Service providers that have a contract directly with the lead agency were not affected by this. Records show that in these events of non-compliance, services were delivered between thirty-one and fifty-two days after IFSP development.

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.

2

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).

Puerto Rico's criteria for timely receipt of early intervention services is if the period from parent consent, at the IFSP meeting, is 30 days or less. The Supervision and Monitoring Unit (SMU) considers that a service has been provided in a timely manner if the criteria is met. During monitoring and data collection activities, randomly selected records are reviewed, and specifically, the IFSP date and the date of service provision in the service provider's progress notes are taken into account. This includes the initial IFSP and subsequent revisions. If there is a case where services were provided more than 30 days from the written consent, the program evaluator will then look for the reasons of delay to further classify the events of non-compliance in extraordinary family circumstances or of program related causes.

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

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

The Puerto Rico Part C team selected the records for the evaluation of Indicator 1 according to the date of the IFSP meeting. The inclusion criterion was that the IFSP had to be developed between July 1st, 2018 and June 30th, 2019. All (7) seven EI programs in Puerto Rico were included for data collection which takes place every year from August to September, right after the fiscal year ends. The SMU uses the child count data that regional programs submit to produce a list of records that fall within the inclusion criterion for this indicator. Based on the population, a random sample size is calculated using the web-based tool, OpenEpi and, a list of random numbers is created using the random numbers module of the same tool. Records are chosen matching the number from the random numbers list to the record from the list. 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. Non-compliance events are also shared and explained to the supervisor. After the on-site data collection is made, the SMU performs the analysis and, if necessary, phone calls with the regional supervisors are scheduled with the purpose of asking for additional information. Documented exceptional family circumstances that prevented timely provision of services are included in the numerator and denominator for calculating the data.

If needed, provide additional information about this indicator here.

The monitoring activities to gather data for compliance indicator 1 take place once in a year, right after the fiscal year ends.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Every year, soon after Puerto Rico receives its determination letter, regional determination letters are developed in order to inform the regional programs of the events of non-compliance found in monitoring activities. Supervisors have the duty of implementing strategies to avoid delays in service delivery. In order to address non-compliance, the SMU requests the regional program a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) in which these strategies, the details of the events of non-compliance, what is expected of the regional program regarding the regulatory requirements, the resources, and the timeline to completion are included. These events are also discussed in the supervisor's monthly meeting and other direct technical assistance activities. Updated data were obtained through the review of new records by convenience-sampling in subsequent on-site monitoring activities, on only those regional programs that had events of non-compliance, to ensure that they are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. If this review reflects 0 no-compliance events, the SMU concludes that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. If the events of noncompliance persist, the SMU schedules follow-up visits to review updated data and provide technical assistance to the regional supervisor.

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

These cases were thoroughly discussed with the supervisors of the regional programs that were the source of noncompliance and were included in the regional determinations. The regional supervisors are expected to implement or strengthen strategies in order to ensure timely service provision. The SMU verified through record review in on-site monitoring activities, that all 5 events of non-compliance reported in FFY 2018 were corrected within one year. Although late, all children received the services stipulated in the IFSP, thus these cases are classified as corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

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

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	99.70%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target>=	99.81%	99.81%	99.82%	99.82%	99.83%
Data	99.81%	99.92%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=	99.83%	99.85%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Puerto Rico State Interagency Coordination Council (SICC) is the group that brings together the main PR EIS stakeholders. During FFY 2018-2019, the SICC worked together in 2 meetings to provide input on issues regarding, personnel development, SSIP, determination results, compliance with IDEA requirements and other collaboration activities. As in the previous year, the January meeting was to analyze and discuss all the information included in the APR to be submitted February 1st. During the following meeting, the SICC continued with its 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 (UPR 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 Foundling, 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. As part of their feedback to this year APR, the stakeholders suggested to start the discussions towards strengthening the child find infrastructure as well as rethinking strategies for increasing the number of questionnaires returned for indicator 4 - Family Outcomes. The work group was engaged in discussions around the differences between regional programs and their impacts on service delivery, data and results.

Stakeholders play 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. Puerto Rico has been able to provide early intervention services in the children's natural environments for the past years. During FFY 2018, all of EI participants (100%) received services in the NE.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	2,364
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	2,364

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of Infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2,364	2,364	100.00%	99.83%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

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

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

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

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

Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3 - Indicator Data

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Puerto Rico State Interagency Coordination Council (SICC) is the group that brings together the main PR EIS stakeholders. During FFY 2018-2019, the SICC worked together in 2 meetings to provide input on issues regarding, personnel development, SSIP, determination results, compliance with IDEA requirements and other collaboration activities. As in the previous year, the January meeting was to analyze and discuss all the information included in the APR to be submitted February 1st. During the following meeting, the SICC continued with its 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 (UPR 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. As part of their feedback to this year APR, the stakeholders suggested to start the discussions towards strengthening the child find infrastructure as well as rethinking strategies for increasing the number of questionnaires returned for indicator 4 - Family Outcomes. The work group was engaged in discussions around the differences between regional programs and their impacts on service delivery, data and results.

The State office explained to the stakeholders about the COS collection method, reporting and data analysis and they are well informed of the continuous EIP efforts to collect more data that are reliable. These have resulted in an increased percentage of children outcomes data reported from 16% in FFY 2013 to 90% in FFY 2017. This FFY 2018, with the continued efforts of the SMU PREIP met the target of reporting 100% of COS data in comparison with the children exiting the Program in the 618 Data Exiting report.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2011	Target>=	43.79%	43.80%	43.81%	43.82%	43.83%
A1	39.40%	Data	43.79%	65.68%	63.83%	67.11%	58.49%
A2	2011	Target>=	56.99%	57.00%	57.01%	57.02%	57.03%
A2	53.90%	Data	56.99%	76.24%	82.64%	85.14%	81.70%
B1	2011	Target>=	46.63%	46.64%	46.65%	46.66%	46.67%
B1	32.50%	Data	46.63%	71.10%	73.53%	76.03%	72.74%
B2	2011	Target>=	34.68%	34.69%	34.70%	34.71%	34.72%
B2	18.70%	Data	34.68%	52.45%	56.01%	56.04%	52.38%
C1	2011	Target>=	38.02%	38.03%	38.04%	38.05%	38.06%
C1	28.30%	Data	38.02%	63.10%	61.18%	63.54%	56.12%
C2	2011	Target>=	51.35%	51.36%	51.37%	51.38%	51.39%
C2	43.90%	Data	51.35%	71.74%	77.94%	80.75%	76.62%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1>=	43.84%	58.60%
Target A2>=	57.04%	84.21%
Target B1>=	46.68%	71.56%
Target B2>=	34.73%	53.46%
Target C1>=	38.07%	56.98%
Target C2>=	51.40%	77.82%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

2,582

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	38	1.47%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	290	11.23%

	Number of children	Percentage of Total
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	77	2.98%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	387	14.99%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,790	69.33%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	464	792	58.49%	43.84%	58.59%	Met Target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,177	2,582	81.70%	57.04%	84.31%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	38	1.47%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	628	24.32%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	536	20.76%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,139	44.11%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	241	9.33%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	1,675	2,341	72.74%	46.68%	71.55%	Met Target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	1,380	2,582	52.38%	34.73%	53.45%	Met Target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	47	1.82%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	412	15.96%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	114	4.42%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	494	19.13%

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,515	58.68%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	608	1,067	56.12%	38.07%	56.98%	Met Target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,009	2,582	76.62%	51.40%	77.81%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's part C exiting 618 data	2,582
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.	710

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

All seven (7) local programs in Puerto Rico gather the data through the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF). It is filled out the day the initial eligibility for Part C services is determined, at the annual determination and at the time of exit. The data collected are also transferred to an Excel sheet designed by the Supervision and Monitoring Unit (SMU). This sheet is sent monthly to the SMU, in which infants and toddlers that exited the Program the month prior the sheet submission, are included. If needed, local programs may review records and/or ask service providers for more information to ensure the data reported are accurate. The SMU makes sure the data are gathered and contacts the local programs if further clarifications are needed. At the time of analysis, the ECTA Center COSF Calculator is used as a guidance for data quality and for correcting data issues that were not assessed during the year. The SMU also consolidates the annual regional information into Puerto Rico's report to use it as the indicator 3 data.

The Puerto Rico EIP calculates the number of children exiting Part C also using the COS Calculator. The 6-month period is measured using the date of initial COSF and the exit date. Since the SMU collected 100% of the COS data, 710 is the number of children who did not receive services for at least 6 months, of those who were reported in COS data.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

This is the second federal fiscal year that it was required for the States to report on all children exiting Part C. The EIP kept implementing strategies to ensure the regional programs were gathering the data to report on this indicator, such as monthly follow up. At the time of the analyses, the SMU matched the number of children exiting Part C as reported in 618 Exiting Data report to the number of children with COS data reported by the regional programs. If data were missing or data quality issues arose, further clarifications and more data were requested to the regional program. In instances where the service provider was no longer part of the EIP, the family moved out of the jurisdiction, or exited Part C because of several unsuccessful attempts of contact, the regional nurse was responsible of collecting the data and filling out the form whereas the data entry personnel was responsible to fill out the Excel form so that the regional supervisor can submit it.

These efforts allowed the PREIP to collect 100% of the COS data compared to the number of children exiting the Program in FFY 2018.

3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3 - OSEP Response

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

3 - Required Actions

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

4 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2006	Target>=	90.46%	90.47%	90.48%	90.49%	90.50%
A	60.00%	Data	90.46%	96.23%	96.96%	96.37%	96.54%
B	2006	Target>=	89.06%	89.07%	89.08%	89.09%	89.10%
B	57.00%	Data	89.06%	96.23%	96.59%	96.12%	95.91%
C	2006	Target>=	94.39%	94.40%	94.41%	94.42%	94.43%
C	79.00%	Data	94.39%	98.12%	98.42%	98.00%	98.90%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A>=	94.51%	97.45%
Target B>=	89.11%	97.19%
Target C>=	94.44%	98.60%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Puerto Rico State Interagency Coordination Council (SICC) is the group that brings together the main PR EIS stakeholders. During FFY 2018-2019, the SICC worked together in 2 meetings to provide input on issues regarding, personnel development, SSIP, determination results, compliance with IDEA requirements and other collaboration activities. As in the previous year, the January meeting was to analyze and discuss all the information included in the APR to be submitted February 1st. During the following meeting, the SICC continued with its 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 (UPR 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. As part of their feedback to this year APR, the stakeholders

suggested to start the discussions towards strengthening the child find infrastructure as well as rethinking strategies for increasing the number of questionnaires returned for indicator 4 - Family Outcomes. The work group was engaged in discussions around the differences between regional programs and their impacts on service delivery, data and results.

Previous comments of the stakeholders included the need to revise the family survey or explore new alternatives of collecting data on these indicators, the identification of the best times for the survey distribution and the selection criteria for the families to be surveyed.

The EI program team decided that the best time for data collection was at transition conferences, or annual eligibility determination/assessment, if the child was no longer eligible for Part C services. This procedure will allow the program to obtain information of a more diverse group of families and ensure compliance with the inclusion criteria for the measurement of this indicator.

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

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	781
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	781
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	760
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	780
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	758
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	780
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	769
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	780

	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2)	96.54%	94.51%	97.44%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2)	95.91%	89.11%	97.18%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2)	98.90%	94.44%	98.59%	Met Target	No Slippage

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

	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.

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 time of exit 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, 2018 to June 30, 2019 in every local program, by age group, eligibility criteria, and by geographic location. Surveys were returned from 7 EIPs throughout Puerto Rico. In total, 781 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4 - OSEP Response

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

4 - Required Actions

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	0.56%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	0.48%	0.49%	0.51%	0.53%	0.55%
Data	0.49%	0.45%	0.66%	0.44%	0.39%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	0.57%	0.58%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Puerto Rico State Interagency Coordination Council (SICC) is the group that brings together the main PR EIS stakeholders. During FFY 2018-2019, the SICC worked together in 2 meetings to provide input on issues regarding, personnel development, SSIP, determination results, compliance with IDEA requirements and other collaboration activities. As in the previous year, the January meeting was to analyze and discuss all the information included in the APR to be submitted February 1st. During the following meeting, the SICC continued with its 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 (UPR 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 Foundling, 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. As part of their feedback to this year APR, the stakeholders suggested to start the discussions towards strengthening the child find infrastructure as well as rethinking strategies for increasing the number of questionnaires returned for indicator 4 - Family Outcomes. The work group was engaged in discussions around the differences between regional programs and their impacts on service delivery, data and results.

The PR SICC has an active role in the dissemination of the availability of early intervention services. During the FFY 2015, the SICC collaborated with the EIP in 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 and service agencies. Each one of the EI regions developed specific dissemination plans using new promotional materials (brochures and posters with child developmental milestones). PR SICC suggested the use of the CDC's Learn the signs, act early materials to disseminate information regarding child development as a strategy for early identification by collaborating partners in order to obtain timely referrals. During subsequent FFY's the EIP had continued these activities as suggested by the ICC.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	116
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/20/2019	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	22,637

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
116	22,637	0.39%	0.57%	0.51%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Compare your results to the national data

The National data for FFY 2017 is 1.25%, whereas Puerto Rico's FFY 2018 is 0.51%. This positions the jurisdiction significantly below national data and slightly below the target established for this indicator for the territory. A decrease of 4,742 in the population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 is observed for this FFY 2018. The number of live births have been continuously decreasing for the past years, and many people have made the decision to move out of the state.

Nevertheless, several Child Find activities were carried out this fiscal year with the objective of meeting the target, such as disseminating EIP information in community settings, for example, hospitals, medical offices and child care centers. Regional programs maintained referral collaborations with other community programs. In May 2019, the Coordinator participated in an event in the University of Puerto Rico Law School which gathered law and education students to disseminate PREIP information and services. Although PR did not meet the established target, an increase of 0.12% in comparison with FFY 2017 data is observed.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

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

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Baseline	2005	2.56%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	3.08%	3.09%	3.10%	3.11%	3.12%
Data	3.09%	3.29%	3.18%	3.08%	2.65%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	3.13%	3.35%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Puerto Rico State Interagency Coordination Council (SICC) is the group that brings together the main PR EIS stakeholders. During FFY 2018-2019, the SICC worked together in 2 meetings to provide input on issues regarding, personnel development, SSIP, determination results, compliance with IDEA requirements and other collaboration activities. As in the previous year, the January meeting was to analyze and discuss all the information included in the APR to be submitted February 1st. During the following meeting, the SICC continued with its 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 (UPR 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 Foundling, 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. As part of their feedback to this year APR, the stakeholders suggested to start the discussions towards strengthening the child find infrastructure as well as rethinking strategies for increasing the number of questionnaires returned for indicator 4 - Family Outcomes. The work group was engaged in discussions around the differences between regional programs and their impacts on service delivery, data and results.

The PR SICC has an active role in the dissemination of the availability of early intervention services. During the FFY 2015, the SICC collaborated with the EIP in 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 and service agencies. Each one of the EI regions developed specific dissemination plans using new promotional materials (brochures and posters with child developmental milestones). PR SICC suggested the use of the CDC's Learn the signs, act early materials to disseminate information regarding child development as a strategy for early identification by collaborating partners in order to obtain timely referrals. During subsequent FFY's the EIP had continued these activities as suggested by the ICC.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	2,364
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/20/2019	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	70,711

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2,364	70,711	2.65%	3.13%	3.34%	Met Target	No Slippage

Compare your results to the national data

For Part C, the 2017 national percentage of infants and toddlers ages birth to three receiving early intervention services under IDEA is 3.26%. Whereas the PR data for FFY 2018 is 3.34%. An increase of 0.69% in comparison with FFY 2017 is observed, and now positions the jurisdiction in the mean with the national average. FFY 2017 was when Hurricanes Irma and Maria made landfall, and the months after the events, families were displaced, roads

were insecure, communication lines suffered severe damage, there was no electric power in the majority of areas in PR and the child count dropped substantially.

As part of the Child Find activities, regional supervisors have the ongoing duty of disseminating EIP information in community settings such as hospitals, medical offices or child care centers. The regional programs report back to the State office the strategies being implemented and any difficulties encountered, in monthly meetings, so new improved strategies can be adopted.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

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

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	86.80%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.35%	99.37%	98.73%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
117	118	100.00%	100%	99.15%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

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

0

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

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

The Puerto Rico Part C team selected the records for the evaluation of Indicator 7 according to the date when the referral was received. The inclusion criterion is that the referral had to be received between July 1st, 2018 and June 30th, 2019. All (7) seven EI programs in Puerto Rico were included for

data collection which takes place every year from August to September. The SMU uses the child count data that regional programs submit to produce a list of records that fall within the inclusion criterion for this indicator. Based on the population, a random sample size is calculated using the web-based tool, OpenEpi and, a list of random numbers is created using the random numbers module of the same tool. Records are chosen matching the number from the random numbers list to the record from the list. 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. Non-compliance events are also shared and explained to the supervisor. After the on-site data collection is made, the SMU performs the analysis and, if necessary, phone calls with the regional supervisors are scheduled with the purpose of asking for additional information. Documented exceptional family circumstances that prevented initial evaluation, assessment and an initial IFSP meeting to be conducted in 45 days or less after the referral is received, are included in the numerator and denominator for calculating the data.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

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

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	96.10%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.53%	93.09%	93.97%	96.03%	95.90%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
106	106	95.90%	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 monitoring

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 recorded in the EI Data System that transition steps were given to the families. The inclusion criterion was toddlers whose third birthday was between September 29st, 2018 and September 28th, 2019 and for whom transition steps were required to be given to the families at least 90 days prior the child's third birthday. The records selected were due to have the transition steps between July 1st, 2018 and June 30th, 2019. All (7) seven EI programs in Puerto Rico were included for data collection. All (7) seven EI programs in Puerto Rico were included for data collection which takes place every year August to September, right after the fiscal year ends. The SMU uses the child count data that regional programs submit to produce a list of records that fall within the inclusion criterion for this indicator. Based on the population, a sample size is calculated using the web-based tool, OpenEpi and, a list of random numbers is created using the random numbers module of the same tool. Records are chosen matching the number from the random numbers list to the record from the list. 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. Non-compliance events are also shared and explained to the supervisor. After the on-site data collection is made, the SMU performs the analysis and, if necessary, phone calls with the regional supervisors are scheduled with the purpose of asking for additional information. Documented exceptional family circumstances that prevented timely transitions steps and transition conference are included in the numerator and denominator for calculating the data.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Every year, soon after Puerto Rico receives its determination letter, regional determination letters are developed in order to inform the regional programs of the events of non-compliance found in monitoring activities. Supervisors have the duty of implementing strategies to avoid delays in service delivery. In order to address noncompliance, the SMU requests the regional program a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) in which these strategies, the details of the events of non-compliance, what is expected of the regional program regarding the regulatory requirements, the resources, and the timeline to completion are included. These events are also discussed in the supervisor's monthly meeting and other direct technical assistance activities. Updated data were obtained through the review of new records by convenience-sampling in subsequent on-site monitoring activities, on only those regional programs that had events of non-compliance, to ensure that they are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. If this review reflects 0 no-compliance events, the SMU concludes that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. If the events of noncompliance persist, the SMU schedules follow-up visits to review updated data and provide technical assistance to the regional supervisor.

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

These cases were thoroughly discussed with the supervisors of the regional programs that were the source of noncompliance and were included in the regional determinations. The regional supervisors are expected to implement or strengthen strategies in order to ensure the development of the IFSP with transition steps at least 90 days prior the child's birthday. The SMU verified through record review in on-site monitoring activities, that all 5 events of non-compliance reported in FFY 2018 were corrected within one year. Although with less than 90 days prior their 3rd birthday, the EIP developed an IFSP with transition steps for each child, thus these cases are classified as corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8B - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	91.40%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	87.65%	90.32%	98.28%	93.50%	85.25%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

YES

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
96	106	85.25%	100%	90.57%	Did Not Meet 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

Puerto Rico Part C team selected the records for the evaluation of Indicator 8B according to the notification to SEA/LEA date recorded in the EI Data System and charts. The inclusion criterion was toddlers whose third birthday was between September 29st, 2018 and September 28th, 2019 and for whom notification to the SEA/LEA was due at least 90 days prior the child's third birthday. The notification for the records selected was due between July 1st, 2018 and June 30th, 2019. All (7) seven EI programs in Puerto Rico were included for data collection which takes place every year from August to September. The SMU uses the child count data that regional programs submit to produce a list of records that fall within the inclusion criterion for this indicator. Based on the population, a sample size is calculated using the web-based tool, OpenEpi and, a list of random numbers is created using the random numbers module of the same tool. Records are chosen matching the number from the random numbers list to the record from the list. For all regional programs, data were collected through monitoring activities conducted by the SMU at the State Office. The Part C Data Manager reviews the list that is sent to the Part B Data Manager no later than the 15th day of every month and that constitutes the SEA/LEA notification for the territory to confirm timely notification to SEA/LEA. If the toddler's information was included in the list at least 90 days prior their birthday, the SMU concludes that notification to Part B was timely. After the on-site data collection is made, the SMU performs the analysis and, if necessary, phone calls with the regional supervisors are scheduled with the purpose of asking for additional information. These activities, the findings and importance of the process are explained to the regional supervisors, as the SMU does with other compliance indicators.

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 monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

Puerto Rico Part C does not select EIS programs for monitoring. All (7) seven EI programs in Puerto Rico were included for the monitoring and data collection activities which take place every year from August to September.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
18	18	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Every year, soon after Puerto Rico receives its determination letter, regional determination letters are developed in order to inform the regional programs of the events of non-compliance found in monitoring activities. Supervisors have the duty of implementing strategies to avoid delays in SEA/LEA notification. In order to address noncompliance, the SMU requests the regional program a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) in which these strategies, the details of the events of non-compliance, what is expected of the regional program regarding the regulatory requirements, the resources, and the timeline to completion are included. These events are also discussed in the supervisor's monthly meeting and other direct technical assistance activities. Updated data were obtained through a subsequent review of the monthly lists on only those regional programs that had events of non-compliance, to ensure that they are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. If this review reflects 0 no-compliance events, the SMU concludes that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. If the events of noncompliance persist, the SMU schedules follow-up visits to review updated data and provide technical assistance to the regional supervisor.

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

These cases were thoroughly discussed with the supervisors of the regional programs that were the source of noncompliance and were included in the regional determinations. The regional supervisors are expected to implement or strengthen strategies in order to ensure notification to SEA/LEA at least 90 days prior the child's birthday. The SMU verified that for 5 cases of noncompliance, although late, the notification to SEA/LEA was made. The remaining 13 cases are considered corrected by the SMU since the child was longer in the jurisdiction.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

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

8B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8B - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

8B - Required Actions

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8C - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	64.20%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.53%	93.09%	93.97%	96.03%	95.90%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
106	106	95.90%	100%	100.00%	Met 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.

0

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

State monitoring

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 transition conference's date that is recorded in the EI Data System. The inclusion criterion was toddlers whose third birthday was between September 29st, 2018 and September 28th, 2019 and for whom transition steps were required to be given to the families at least 90 days prior to the child's third birthday. The records selected were due to have the transition conference between July 1st, 2017 and June 30th, 2018. All (7) seven EI programs in Puerto Rico were included for data collection. The SMU used the regional child counts to produce a list of records that fall within the inclusion criterion for the selection of a random sample. A random numbers list is generated based on a sample size calculated using a web tool, OpenEpi. Records are then chosen matching the number from the random numbers list to the record from the records list. For all regional programs, data were collected through on-site 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 timely transitions steps and transition conference are included in the numerator and denominator for calculating the data.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Every year, soon after Puerto Rico receives its determination letter, regional determination letters are developed in order to inform the regional programs of the events of non-compliance found in monitoring activities. Supervisors have the duty of implementing strategies to avoid delays in conducting the transition conference. In order to address noncompliance, the SMU requests the regional program a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) in which these strategies, the details of the events of non-compliance, what is expected of the regional program regarding the regulatory requirements, the resources, and the timeline to completion are included. These events are also discussed in the supervisor's monthly meeting and other direct technical assistance activities. Updated data were obtained through the review of new records by convenience-sampling in subsequent on-site monitoring activities, on only those regional programs that had events of non-compliance, to ensure that they are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. If this review reflects 0 non-compliance events, the SMU concludes that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. If the events of noncompliance persist, the SMU schedules follow-up visits to review updated data and provide technical assistance to the regional supervisor.

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

These cases were thoroughly discussed with the supervisors of the regional programs that were the source of noncompliance and were included in the regional determinations. The regional supervisors are expected to implement or strengthen strategies in order to ensure transition conferences are conducted at least 90 days prior to the child's birthday. The SMU verified through record review in on-site monitoring activities, that all 5 events of non-compliance reported in FFY 2018 were corrected within one year. Although with less than 90 days prior to their 3rd birthday, the EIP conducted transition conferences for each child, thus these cases are classified as corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

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

8C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8C - OSEP Response

8C - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Puerto Rico has Part B due process procedures adopted.

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

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 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Puerto Rico State Interagency Coordination Council (SICC) is the group that brings together the main PR EIS stakeholders. During FFY 2018-2019, the SICC worked together in 2 meetings to provide input on issues regarding, personnel development, SSIP, determination results, compliance with IDEA requirements and other collaboration activities. As in the previous year, the January meeting was to analyze and discuss all the information included in the APR to be submitted February 1st. During the following meeting, the SICC continued with its 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 (UPR 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 Foundling, 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. As part of their feedback to this year APR, the stakeholders suggested to start the discussions towards strengthening the child find infrastructure as well as rethinking strategies for increasing the number of questionnaires returned for indicator 4 - Family Outcomes. The work group was engaged in discussions around the differences between regional programs and their impacts on service delivery, data and results.

Historical Data

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

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

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

10 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role

Designated Lead Agency Director

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

Name:

Manuel I. Vargas Bernal, MD, MPH

Title:

Maternal, Child and Adolescent Health Division Director

Email:

mivargas@salud.pr.gov

Phone:

787-765-2929

Submitted on:

04/28/20 5:20:41 PM