

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

General Supervision System:

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

Monitoring

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C system in Nebraska, known as the Early Development Network (EDN), is co-administered by the Nebraska Department of Education (NDE), Office of Special Education and the Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), Division of Medicaid and Long-term Care (aka "Co-Lead Agencies" or "the Co-Leads"). Per the Nebraska Early Intervention Act, these 2 agencies are responsible for the planning, implementation, and administration of the federal Early Intervention Services System and the Nebraska Early Intervention Act. Additionally, the Nebraska Early Intervention Act requires interagency Planning Region Teams (PRT's) to be responsible for assisting in the planning and implementation of the Early Intervention Act in each local community or region.

The IDEA Part C regulations require the Nebraska Part C Co-Lead Agencies to monitor local Early Intervention Programs on the implementation of early intervention regulations outlined in NDE 92 NAC 52 (Rule 52) and DHHS 480 NAC 3.

Each of the 28 PRT's is an interagency coordinating council made up of local schools, health and human service agencies, community agencies, Head Start, families, and others who provide early intervention services. Each PRT covers a specific geographic area of the state and is responsible for implementation of an interagency system of services in the region. The EDN Services Coordination agency within the PRT assumes the responsibility for delivery of the entitlement of services coordination in the region. The EDN Services Coordination agency may be the same agency selected by the PRT as the lead agency, but in many cases, these are two agencies working collaboratively, to provide early intervention services in the region.

The Nebraska Part C Co-Lead Monitoring process gathers data from multiple sources, analyzes results, identifies gaps with Part C services, rates PRT performance, and stimulates the development of improvement activities for the PRT. The monitoring process relies on multiple sources of data to gauge the effectiveness of early intervention supports and services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

Nebraska has developed monitoring procedures which require PRT's to be reviewed at least once every three (3) years for implementation of the requirements under Part C of IDEA. The Nebraska Part C Co-Lead Agencies review a variety of data sources to document each PRT's compliance with NDE 92 NAC 52 (Rule 52) and DHHS 480 NAC 3, including:

1. IFSP File Review
2. Completion of prior Corrective Action Plans;
3. Policies and Procedures Review;
4. Forms Review;
5. Review of results from mediations, complaint and due process reports; and
6. Review of supporting data from sources such as, PRT child count, Referral vs. Verification Data, Referral Sources, CAPTA, and Performance Reports for the last 3 years.

The steps in the monitoring process include:

Step One: The Part C Co-Leads schedule the monitoring plan for the upcoming year. The monitoring team is composed of the Part C Co-Coordinators and additional NDE staff to assist in the Monitoring process. The PRT Lead Agency receives the Notification letter informing the PRT of the scheduled date of the upcoming Part C Monitoring.

The Part C Monitoring Team meets with the PRT members to discuss the various components of the monitoring process, including IFSP file reviews, correction of noncompliance, verification of correction of noncompliance, how information generated from the monitoring activities will be incorporated into the CAP and PRT Improvement planning process to improve results for infants/toddlers with disabilities and their families.

Step Two: The Part C Monitoring Team reviews the PRT's early intervention process, including the following components:

- Forms used by the PRT to document the implementation of 92 NAC 52 and 480 NAC 3
- IFSP Files
- PRT Policies, Procedures and Practices
- Review of any complaints filed and investigated by the Co-Lead Agencies pursuant to 92 NAC 52 and 480 NAC 3
- Review of any due process findings issued pursuant to 92 NAC 55
- Review of the timely correction of any noncompliance identified during the previous monitoring cycle.
- Issues identified as part of previous fiscal review or sub-recipient fiscal reviews.

Step Three: The Part C Monitoring Team conducts the Focused Onsite PRT Exit Conference. The result of the PRT Monitoring is shared with the PRT Members. This visit allows an opportunity for clarification or submission of evidence to determine whether or not compliance was met.

Step Four: The Part C Co-Leads provide written notification of Findings to the PRT. The PRT must submit a CAP within 45 days to the Part C Co-Leads. Upon submission of the PRT's CAP, the Part C Co-Leads will give approval in writing.

Step Five: Verification of Correction of Noncompliance and Closeout of Monitoring Process. Pursuant to 92 NAC 52-004.02E, all noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible, and in no case later than one year from the date on which the PRT is notified of a finding of noncompliance. For all individual instances of noncompliance that can be corrected, the PRT must immediately correct and submit evidence of correction to the Part C Co-Leads, who will document the receipt of evidence of the individual correction. The Closeout Letter will be completed by Part C Co-Leads following the completion of the verification activities and the final report. This Closeout Letter is a clear statement by the Part C Co-Leads that the PRT has corrected the areas of noncompliance previously identified, has successfully completed the CAP, and the PRT is now in full compliance with IDEA Part C Regulations, NDE 92 NAC 52 , and DHHS 480 NAC 3.

Dispute Resolution

Complaints

The NDE Complaint Investigator will complete the complaint process as identified in 92 NAC 51-009.11, meeting the appropriate timelines. All correspondence to the complainants is completed by the Complaint Investigator. If any noncompliance is identified, the agency will be contacted and required to complete the CAP, and the Complaint Investigator will send the Closeout Letter.

Due Process Hearings

The NDE Legal Office provides guidance to Parents, etc., on completing the Dispute Resolution element of the due process hearing in accordance with 92 NAC 51-009.13. Other mediation requests are handled through the regional Mediation Centers, in accordance with 92 NAC 51-009.12.

Mediation

Mediation is an integral part of the complaint and due process procedures. There are six (6) Mediation Centers located regionally throughout the State of Nebraska to provide services to parents, families and school districts.

Provision of a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE)

Since Nebraska is a Birth-mandate state, the Nebraska Department of Education, Office of Special Education works with school districts, service agencies and approved cooperatives to ensure that all infants and toddlers with disabilities in the State of Nebraska are receiving a free, appropriate public education (FAPE) in their natural environment to the maximum extent appropriate.

Timely and Accurate Reporting of Data

The Nebraska Department of Education, Office of Special Education works with PRT's, school districts, service agencies and approved cooperatives to ensure that all data requirements are met in reporting the data. "Deadlines are Deadlines" is the

rule for reporting data on time, and ensuring that the data is accurate and not needing to be returned for further review and revision.

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.

For several years, the Nebraska Part C Co-Leads-- Department of Education (NDE) and the Department of Health and Human Services (NDHHS), also referred to in Nebraska as the Early Development Network (EDN)—have provided significant training and technical assistance (TA) consistent with evidence-based research in early intervention/early childhood special education (EI/ECSE) and the mission, beliefs and principles promoted by National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC). Intensive statewide training began in 2001 focusing on the provision of services in natural environments, use of the Primary Service Provider service delivery model, and coaching and teaming practices. In later years, training in the use of the Routines Based Interview (RBI) as a child and family assessment process and writing functional and meaningful child and family outcomes was added. The RBI is an assessment tool that uses the research about how young children learn, i.e. through natural learning opportunities within their family, to facilitate family engagement toward improving child and family outcomes. These training initiatives were provided in large part by Dr. Robin McWilliam of the Siskin Institute in TN, and Dathan Rush and M’Lisa Shelden of the Family Infant Preschool Program in NC-- national researchers and presenters on evidence based practices in early intervention-- and were coordinated through the NDE Early Childhood Training Center (ECTC), which continues to be the hub for professional development across all early childhood systems in Nebraska including childcare, Head Start, Part B 619 and Part C. ECTC coordinates a centralized system of professional development opportunities and tracking across settings where young children with disabilities and their families participate. Local Planning Region Teams (PRT) and school districts also access the ECTC with their training requests, which are coordinated regionally by 7 Early Learning Connection coordinators (ELCs). The ELCs are responsible for ensuring professional development opportunities are provided to meet state and federal requirements for all early care and education professionals within their region and are ultimately part of the ECTC system.

Although many of our state’s efforts are now primarily related to the RDA work, Nebraska has additional ongoing training efforts that peripherally impact the State Identified Measureable Result (SIMR) as well. These training efforts include: Special Care which focuses on child care providers who care for children with disabilities; Early Learning Guidelines trainings which provides information about developmentally appropriate practices across domains in inclusive settings; Bridges Out of Poverty; CSEFEL Teaching Pyramid; CAPTA-related trainings to child welfare, court and EI personnel; and Circle of Security training – all of which are supported through collaboration with multiple state and private agencies - Nebraska Children and Families Foundation, Nebraska Division of Public Health/Maternal Child Health unit, Nebraska Division of Child Welfare, Nebraska Head Start State Collaboration Office, University of Nebraska’s Center for Children, Families and the Law, University of Nebraska’s Munroe Meyer Institute, Higher Education partners at the University of Nebraska Lincoln and Omaha, and the Nebraska Infant Mental Health Association.

The Parent Training Information center (PTI) is a family partner to the EDN Co-Leads and provides numerous training activities for families, services coordinators and services providers as well as PRT members. Family representatives have the opportunity to influence training and TA activities both at the state and local levels by participating in planning sessions and through the provision of feedback. Trainings offered to families include: All about EDN, IFSP and IEP training, and Rebuilding Dreams which addresses family grief at learning that their child has a disability. Families can also call PTI at any time to receive individual TA.

Beginning in 2012, after spending several years using 3 different child assessment tools to collect data for the federal child outcomes (in Nebraska this is referred to as “Results Matter”), Nebraska moved to a single assessment tool, Teaching Strategies GOLD. Currently, annual Basic GOLD training for new teachers and new administrators is offered in rotating locations so as to provide access for new staff including early intervention providers as part of the broader early care and education system. The Teaching Strategies GOLD trainings include instruction in use of the on-line system for data collection and the ELCs are responsible for coordinating any individual TA needs within their regions.

Nebraska has spent considerable energy building an “internal” support structure—necessary if we are to move innovative practices and programs from initial training to full implementation. This effort began sincerely in 2009 when two Nebraska practitioners attended the Siskin National Routines Based Interview (RBI) training institute in Chattanooga, TN to become nationally certified interviewers. Building infrastructure from the top down, the Part C Co-Lead Coordinators and the Part B 619 Coordinator, along with the two newly certified RBI trainers formed a State level implementation team. Using the RBI as the first of Nebraska’s “usable interventions”, the state began to pilot a statewide implementation plan of training and TA for the RBI as well as other evidence based practices. Over the next 4 years, Nebraska Part C dollars funded an additional sixteen service providers and services coordinators to attend the RBI Siskin Institute with the intent of strategically placing certified RBI trainers geographically across the state.

Simultaneously, over these same 4 years, the ECTC coordinated professional development opportunities, funded by NDE/DHHS, to address evidence-based practices directly impacted by use of the RBI, e.g. Support Based Home Visits, Integrated Service Delivery, and Collaborative Consultation with Childcare. Professional development opportunities and TA have been facilitated through the use of the Nebraska Team Self-Assessment Tool—Implementing Evidence-Based Practices in Natural and Inclusive Environments for Children Birth to 3. This tool was adapted from the original work of Robin McWilliam. The Nebraska version was piloted with 10 teams from across the state who came together to reach consensus about priority practices needing ongoing TA. Based on this initial work, these ten teams became our state's first local implementation teams. The statewide coordinators provide TA to support the work of these teams through biannual conference calls and assistance.

Because use of the RBI impacts the overall EI process, the focus of the stakeholder groups and our professional development/TA expanded to include evidence based practices beyond child and family assessment. Using the implementation science research, the state leadership team developed an implementation plan aimed at bringing other EI teams from across the state (both Educational Service Unit and school district based teams) on board. In order to sustain the work already begun, the leadership team looked to the RBI trainers and coaches on these stakeholder teams to be not only be leaders within their programs, or PRT, but to assist the state level team in planning for new EI teams. The team self-assessments, facilitated by one or both of the two statewide consultants, became a pre-requisite for targeted TA to new teams and results in a direct communication link back to the state level team regarding implementation problems, issues or challenges. RBI trainer/coach conference calls scheduled along with the existing stakeholder calls has allowed for the development of an RBI statewide fidelity process as well as specific planning for ongoing training and TA.

The Early Development Network (EDN) website provides access for service providers, administrators, services coordinators, planning region teams and families to all things Part C related including regulations, guidelines, examples and samples from local PRTs, and training announcements. The site also connects to on-line training modules which have been developed over the past 3 years to address such foundational topics as the development of quality IFSPs, home visitation principles, Medicaid waiver, services coordination and pre-service training for new services coordinators. Additionally, because of the ongoing work with the RBI, a website focusing on evidence based practices for service providers, services coordinators and administrators was launched three years ago. This site is organized around the aforementioned EI team self-assessment tool to allow users just-in-time, informational, one-pagers highlighting a description of each practice, its basis in regulation and/or research, and on-line tools to use.

In order to more efficiently use federal Part C dollars, the state leadership team offered its first Nebraska-based RBI training during the summer of 2013. Utilizing the skills of the state's Siskin trained RBI cadre, Nebraska's "RBI Boot Camp" yielded a new group of RBI trained service providers and service coordinators, offering even broader statewide implementation. The Boot Camp, offered again in the summer of 2014, has helped current stakeholder teams to sustain the RBI practice to fidelity and train new team members, while also training service providers and services coordinators from new areas of the state. Although the initial focus of the Boot Camp was the development of routines-based interviewing skills and writing functional outcomes, an additional component was added in 2014: a training of the trainer (TOT) session. The TOT includes recommended training practices and processes, recommended fidelity checks, as well Power Point presentations, handouts, etc. Teams with RBI approved trainers have been invited to join the state stakeholder teams now re-purposed as RBEI or Routines Based Early Intervention.

In keeping with the expansion of implementing evidence based practices beyond the RBI, the Co-Leads hosted a webinar about the primary service provider approach and then brought Dathan Rush and M'Lisa Shelden to the state for an institute in February, 2014. The institute focused on natural learning opportunities, coaching and teaming practices. Teams were required to have participated in the team self-assessment, to be using the RBI, to have organized team meetings and be representative of all Part C services including an administrator/coordinator/supervisor. In addition to the 2 day institute, a half day training was provided for "internal master coaches"...one person appointed from each team. These master coaches received on-going supports by Rush and Shelden via coaching logs and individual feedback provided through monthly coaching calls, again funded by Part C dollars. Their role is to provide coaching to their teams as they implement the new practices.

New EDN services coordinators have the opportunity to participate in biannual pre-service training and all services coordinators, service providers and Part C supervisors participate in face to face training, typically as part of an annual EDN conference, which also includes EI service providers and administrators. In addition the Co-Leads provide TA by request through face to face meetings, conference calls and webinars.

The 2014 EDN conference provided a forum for training on the new Nebraska Part C regulations, and offered a technical assistance guide (available on-line). The training and the TA guide provided guidance regarding the implementation of the new regulations. In addition, the conference was used to launch the recommendation of the Co-Leads that the RBI be used as the family and child assessment tool to meet both federal and state regulations and to meet RDA (Results Driven

Accountability). The RDA presentation included several components: (1) Nebraska's RDA strategies: the RBI, functional child and family outcomes, and routines based home visits, (2) the shift in focus from individual EI teams to the Planning Region Teams (PRTs) for both training and evaluation purposes as part of RDA, and (3) the re-organization of the statewide Part C monitoring system to be reviewed by PRT as well. The Co-Leads have been and will continue to provide targeted training/TA as a result of needs identified via this monitoring process.

Because Nebraska has chosen to implement RBEI within pilot PRTs initially, professional development and TA efforts are being planned on both a micro (pilots) and a macro level (statewide over the next 5 years). Webinars have been developed to provide an overview of the RDA work, introduce the RBI, and provide functional outcome guidance. In addition, there will be RBI and functional outcome training in the local pilot PRT sites. Regional TA RBEI trainer/coaches are also being developed and will be utilized over the next year to implement data-driven professional development and TA. Over the course of the next 5 years, evaluation procedures will be put in place for the implementation of the RBI, the functional child and family outcomes and quality home visits. Ongoing feedback to the pilot PRTs regarding evaluation results will be conducted. The results will be used to make adjustments to training and TA initially at the pilot PRT level, but ultimately to the statewide plan to bring the state to "full" implementation.

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.

See explanation in Technical Assistance System.

Stakeholder Involvement:

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

Stakeholder Involvement: Nebraska regularly seeks input from stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation or implementation strategies. Specific to the development of the State Improvement Plan and Annual Performance Report, Nebraska has established a broad based stakeholder group. The group included representatives of parents, school district Directors of Special Education, special education staff, early childhood programs, Routines Based Early Intervention (RBEI), higher education, services coordination, Head Start, Health and Human Services, community agencies, early intervention services providers, court system, school psychologists, early childhood special education, and the medical field.

This group has met periodically throughout the past year and will continue meeting to establish/review targets and performance as indicated in the SPP/APR and the development and implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Thus far the Stakeholders have reviewed historical data around each of the indicators and established targets for each of the indicators. Additionally, the Stakeholders assisted NDE in establishing the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). As the Stakeholders continue meeting they will provide guidance and input on the development of the second and third phases of the SSIP process.

In addition to the Stakeholder group established specifically for the purpose of gathering input on the SSIP and SPP/APR, Nebraska also obtains input from the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) and the Early Childhood Interagency Coordinating Council (ECICC). These Councils are established pursuant to 34 CFR 300.167 and 34 CFR 303.600 and as such provides for input from a diverse group of stakeholders. The Councils regularly discuss the SPP/APR and provides input on the targets and strategies contained therein. SEAC and ECICC will continue to be utilized for input on the development of the SSIP and the SIMR.

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2012 performance of each EIS Program or Provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2012 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2012 APR in 2014, is available.

Planning Region Team performance on each of the APR indicators is reported each spring on the Early Development Network website. The report can be found at, <http://edn.ne.gov/spp/regional-data.html>. The Early Development Network website is a site that provides information to the public, families, services providers and the Planning Region Teams on the Early Intervention program in Nebraska. A copy of the state's SPP is also located on the EDN site, <http://edn.ne.gov/spp/annual-performance-report.html>, as well as on the Nebraska Department of Education, Special Education office website at, <http://www.education.ne.gov/sped/publicreporting.html>.

Indicator 1: Timely provision of services

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments



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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.43%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	1,434	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
1,434	1434	100%	100%	100%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner)	0
---	---

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

- State monitoring
- State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

The Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) and Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services (NDHHS), acting as co-lead agencies (the Co-Leads), are responsible for ensuring Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is

FFY 2013 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

fully implemented for all infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families through the Early Development Network (EDN). The Part C Co-Leads monitor the state's 28 Planning Region Teams (PRTs) on a three year cycle. IFSP files and other records maintained by Services Coordinators are reviewed for compliance with IDEA and Medicaid.

The Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) checklist file review for Improving Learning for Children with Disabilities (ILCD) gathers data regarding the receipt of early intervention services on IFSPs in a timely manner.

In FFY 2013, Five (5) of the Planning Regions participated in an IFSP file review for a total of 52 files. All 52 files (100%) were in compliance with the IFSP completed in a timely manner.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		86.00%	86.50%	87.00%	87.50%	88.00%	90.00%	90.50%
Data	91.03%	99.04%	96.03%	92.70%	95.90%	96.75%	97.86%	97.60%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	96.75%	96.75%	97.00%	97.50%	98.00%	98.20%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please reference Introduction - Description of Stakeholder Involvement.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	1,411	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	1,434	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
1,411	1,434	97.60%	96.75%	98.39609%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

--

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A1	2013	Target ≥					24.00%	70.90%	71.40%	71.90%
		Data				23.50%	70.40%	74.00%	78.00%	66.00%
A2	2013	Target ≥					49.00%	74.10%	74.60%	75.10%
		Data				48.50%	73.60%	75.40%	79.60%	37.10%
B1	2013	Target ≥					21.60%	61.20%	61.70%	62.20%
		Data				21.10%	60.70%	63.00%	66.80%	58.50%
B2	2013	Target ≥					46.90%	64.80%	71.30%	71.80%
		Data				46.40%	64.30%	68.60%	73.00%	33.70%
C1	2013	Target ≥					42.10%	74.30%	74.80%	75.30%
		Data				41.60%	73.80%	74.20%	78.90%	60.00%
C2	2013	Target ≥					55.20%	69.40%	69.90%	70.40%
		Data				54.70%	68.90%	72.90%	75.90%	26.10%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	39.40%	39.50%	40.00%	40.50%	41.00%	41.50%
Target A2 ≥	43.60%	43.70%	44.50%	45.50%	46.00%	47.00%
Target B1 ≥	40.10%	40.20%	40.50%	41.00%	41.50%	42.50%
Target B2 ≥	33.40%	33.50%	34.00%	34.50%	35.00%	36.00%
Target C1 ≥	55.70%	55.80%	56.50%	57.00%	58.50%	60.00%
Target C2 ≥	71.10%	71.20%	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please reference Introduction - Description of Stakeholder Involvement.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	689
--	-----

Does the State’s Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or “at-risk infants and toddlers”) under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? No

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

	Number of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	1
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	312
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	75
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	129
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	172

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	204	517	66.00%	39.40%	39.45841%
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	301	689	37.10%	43.60%	43.68650%

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

	Number of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	3
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	364
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	91
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	156
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	75

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	247	614	58.50%	40.10%	40.22801%
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	231	689	33.70%	33.40%	33.52685%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	3
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	104
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	42

	Number of Children
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	93
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	275

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	135	242	60.00%	55.70%	55.78512%
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	368	517	26.10%	71.10%	71.17988%

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? No
 Provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” and list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Teaching Strategies (TS) GOLD is a scientifically-based authentic, observational assessment system designed for children from birth through kindergarten. In Nebraska, it is used for children from birth to kindergarten to evaluate their development and learning across the three functional outcomes. At a child’s entry and exit, teachers/providers gather and document observations in the GOLD online system, which form the basis of their scoring across four areas of development (social-emotional, physical, language and cognitive) and two areas of content learning (literacy and mathematics). Objectives and dimensions that comprise each of the functional outcomes are based on a crosswalk recommended by the national Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center. Criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” was determined through Item Response Theory (IRT) analyses by Teaching Strategies, based on a national sample. The algorithms result in a 7-point rating system that parallels the ECO Child Outcome Summary (COS) ratings. These ratings by age are programmed into the GOLD online system which generates a rating based on TS GOLD scores. Research studies examining the reliability and validity of TS GOLD may be found at <http://teachingstrategies.com/assessment/research/>.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Outcome 3 has fewer scores as a subset. The new cut scores could not be applied to 172 children as TS GOLD added items to this functional domain after the entry assessment period for these children.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

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

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Targets for FFY 2013 were carried forward from FFY 2012 as noted earlier in this indicator.

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2006	Target ≥				74.00%	74.00%	74.00%	74.00%	74.00%
		Data		73.80%	74.80%	77.20%	77.90%	78.40%	82.10%	83.84%
B	2006	Target ≥				71.00%	71.00%	71.00%	71.00%	71.00%
		Data		70.50%	69.90%	73.40%	75.00%	74.40%	79.90%	80.50%
C	2006	Target ≥				84.00%	84.00%	84.00%	84.00%	84.00%
		Data		84.00%	88.30%	88.10%	89.30%	88.90%	91.30%	93.32%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	83.00%	83.00%	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%	87.00%
Target B ≥	80.50%	81.00%	81.50%	82.00%	82.30%	82.60%
Target C ≥	91.30%	91.30%	91.40%	91.50%	91.60%	91.70%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please reference Introduction - Description of Stakeholder Involvement.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent families participating in Part C	1,065
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	908
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	1,065
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	862
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	1,065
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	973
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	1,065

FFY 2012	FFY 2013	FFY 2013
----------	----------	----------

FFY 2013 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Data*	Target*	Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	83.84%	83.00%	85.25822%
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	80.50%	80.50%	80.93897%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	93.32%	91.30%	91.36150%

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

The survey items were validated by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) as part of the Impact on Family Scale (IFS). Based on highly successful return rates in past years, Nebraska continued to use a personalized introductory letter to families before delivering the survey, a follow-up postcard to families, and personal contacts by local representatives to remind families to return the survey. This year the statewide return rate is 67.7%; approximately 2.2% higher than last year. Comparing return rates by Planning Region Teams across the state, the lowest regional return rate was 42.3% and the highest regional return rate was 95.3%.

Nebraska also attempted to ensure representativeness by hand-delivering the survey to every family enrolled in Part C. Families identified as Spanish-speaking received all survey materials translated into Spanish and provided a toll-free phone number that was answered by a Spanish translator who could answer questions or read the survey to the family. A separate toll-free phone number was provided through PTI-Nebraska for families who speak other languages or those needing special assistance in reading and/or understanding the survey questions. The Nebraska survey also asks families to identify their race/ethnicity, child's age, and length of time in program.

Surveys were keyed by Westat staff and analysis of the data for the 28 Planning Region Teams was conducted by Dr. Haidee Bernstein at Westat. Rasch Analysis was conducted by Dr. Batya Elbaum that revealed a mean IFS measure at 689.5 with a scale reliability at .92. Applying the standard adopted by Nebraska Part C, corresponding measures of 538.9, 555.9 and 516.1 for sub-indicators 4a, 4b, and 4c respectively, the percent of agreement by surveyed families was calculated.

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? Yes

Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State

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

Submitted collection tool: [Part C Family Survey - English](#)

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		0.75%	0.75%	0.76%	0.76%	0.77%	0.77%	0.77%
Data	0.64%	0.71%	0.78%	0.66%	0.68%	0.71%	0.68%	0.57%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	0.57%	0.57%	0.60%	0.63%	0.66%	0.70%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please reference Introduction - Description of Stakeholder Involvement.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	156	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013	12/16/2014	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	25,677	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
156	25,677	0.57%	0.57%	0.60755%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

--

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		1.75%	1.75%	1.76%	1.76%	1.77%	1.77%	1.77%
Data	1.67%	1.74%	1.74%	1.75%	1.86%	1.94%	1.91%	1.88%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	1.81%	1.84%	1.86%	1.88%	1.90%	1.92%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please reference Introduction - Description of Stakeholder Involvement.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	1,434	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013	12/16/2014	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	77,541	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
1,434	77,541	1.88%	1.81%	1.84934%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

--

Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	79.80%	61.36%	92.23%	90.83%	97.20%	99.60%	97.80%	95.90%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
43	52	95.90%	100%	96.15385%

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)	7
--	---

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

- State monitoring
- State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

The Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) and Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services (NDHHS), acting as co-lead agencies (a.k.a. the Co-Leads), are responsible for ensuring Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is fully implemented for all infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families through the Early Development Network (EDN). The Part C Co-Leads monitor the state's 28 Planning Region Teams (PRTs) on a three year cycle.

The Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) checklist file review for Improving Learning for Children with Disabilities (ILCD) gathers data regarding the evaluation, assessment and Initial IFSP to be in compliance with the 45-day timeline.

In FFY 2013, Five (5) of the Planning Regions participated in an IFSP file review for a total of 52 files. In 9 of the files the 45-day timeline was not met; of these, 7 files were documented to indicate delay was due to exceptional family circumstances which were the result of child hospitalization/illness and/or parent personal request.

The Co-Leads notified the 2 EIS programs in writing concerning the findings of noncompliance and the requirement that the noncompliance be corrected as soon as possible but in no case more than one year from identification. The State has verified

FFY 2013 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

that the EIS programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and have ensured that the child received an initial evaluation, assessment and IFSP meeting, although late, and the services listed on the IFSP within a timely manner from the IFSP meeting.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	6	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The Co-Leads notified each EIS program in writing concerning the finding of noncompliance and the requirement that the noncompliance be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year from identification. The State verified that each EIS program not in compliance, correctly implemented the specific regulatory requirement and ensured that all children received an evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, and the services listed on the IFSP in a timely manner as noted in the FFY 2012 APR. Each EIS program was required to develop and implement a Corrective Action Plan to ensure correction of noncompliance within one year. The Co-Leads monitored the implementation of the Corrective Action Plan. In addition, the Co-Leads reviewed files of newly-referred children for assurance that compliance was met and the CAP-related processes, as well as specific regulatory requirements, were implemented. Within one year of identification each EIS program was found to be in 100% compliance in meeting the 45-day timeline.

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

Each EIS program was required to develop and implement a Corrective Action Plan to ensure correction of noncompliance within one year. The Co-Leads monitored the implementation of the Corrective Action Plan. In addition, the Co-Leads reviewed files of newly-referred children for assurance that compliance was met and the CAP-related processes, as well as specific regulatory requirements, were implemented. Within one year of identification each EIS program was found to be in 100% compliance in meeting the 45-day timeline.

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	86.00%	50.00%	55.40%	94.40%	96.70%	95.00%	94.00%	94.80%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2013 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

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
21	25	94.80%	100%	84.00000%

Explanation of Slippage

A fewer number of Planning Regions and IFSP files were monitored compared to the previous year, therefore the percentage of noncompliance yielded does not comprise a majority of the total number of PRT's or IFSP files within the state. Additionally, slippage can be attributed to 4 transition plans which were found to be out of compliance due to the lack of the individual family step contained within the transition plan or due to the plan being completed late (did not meet the 90 day timeline). Therefore, it appears that compliance with the transition plans and timeline is at a reasonably high level. Because the requirements and appropriate documentation of transition plans and timeline for children exiting Part C has such a significant impact on the provision of services to infants and toddlers, the Co-Leads believe that it is important to continue training to ensure that all EIS programs correctly implement the specific regulatory requirements and have strategies in place

to ensure compliance. The Co-Leads will continue to conduct additional professional development/technical assistance activities as outlined under the Professional Development and Technical Assistance section of the APR.

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

- State monitoring
- State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

The Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) and Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services (NDHHS), acting as co-lead agencies (a.k.a. the Co-Leads), are responsible for ensuring Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is fully implemented for all infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families through the Early Development Network (EDN). The Part C Co-Leads monitor the state's 28 Planning Region Teams (PRTs) on a three year cycle.

In FFY 2013, Five (5) of the Planning Regions participated in an IFSP file review for a total of 52 files, of which 25 files had transition plans reviewed for compliance. The Co-Leads determined that all 25 files contained complete transition plans prior to the child exiting Part C. However, 4 transition plans were found to be out of compliance due to the lack of the individual family step or due to being completed late.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	3	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

In each case of noncompliance, the Co-Leads notified the EIS program in writing concerning the finding of noncompliance and the requirement that the noncompliance be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year from identification. The State verified that each EIS program not in compliance correctly implemented the specific regulatory requirement and ensured that all children exiting Part C received an IFSP with transition steps and services prior to exiting Part C. Each EIS program was required to develop and implement a Corrective Action Plan to ensure correction of noncompliance within one year. The Co-Leads monitored the implementation of the Corrective Action Plan. In addition, the Co-Leads reviewed different files of children exiting Part C for assurance that compliance was met and the CAP-related processes, as well as specific regulatory requirements, were implemented. Within one year of identification each EIS program was found to be in 100% compliance.

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

Each EIS program was required to develop and implement a Corrective Action Plan to ensure correction of noncompliance within one year. The Co-Leads monitored the implementation of the Corrective Action Plan. In addition, the Co-Leads reviewed additional files of children exiting Part C for assurance that compliance was met and the CAP-related processes, as well as specific regulatory requirements, were implemented. Within one year of identification each EIS program was found to be in 100% compliance. In the regions where transition plans did not contain appropriate documentation of transition plan steps and services, the Co-Leads provided technical assistance on appropriate documentation of transition plans for children exiting Part C. The requirements and appropriate documentation of transition plans for children exiting Part C will continue to be a training topic to ensure that all EIS programs correctly implement the specific regulatory requirements and have strategies in place to ensure compliance. The state has verified that each EIS program is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and ensured that all children, who had not yet exited Part C, were provided with appropriate transition

plans documenting all necessary transition steps and services prior to the children exiting Part C.

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	86.00%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

- Yes
- No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
25	25	100%	100%	100%

Describe the method used to collect these data

State Monitoring. The Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) and Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services (NDHHS), acting as co-lead agencies (a.k.a. the Co-Leads), are responsible for ensuring Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is fully implemented for all infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families through the Early Development Network (EDN). The Part C Co-Leads monitor the state's 28 Planning Region Teams (PRTs) on a three year cycle.

In FFY 2013, Five (5) of the Planning Regions participated in an IFSP file review for a total of 52 files, of which 25 files had children exiting Part C who received proper Notification to LEA and SEA as the child was potentially eligible for Part B.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? No

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100%	100%	100%	100%	95.70%	95.00%	84.00%	93.10%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2013 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

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
23	25	93.10%	100%	92.00000%

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

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

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

The Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) and Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services (NDHHS), acting as co-lead agencies (the Co-Leads), are responsible for ensuring Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is fully implemented for all infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families through the Early Development Network (EDN). The Part C Co-Leads monitor the state's 28 Planning Region Teams (PRTs) on a three year cycle.

In FFY 2013, Five (5) of the Planning Regions participated in an IFSP file review for a total of 52 files, of which 25 files had children exiting Part C. 23 of the 25 files reflected a transition conference was conducted by the third birthday. 2 files were found to be out of compliance due to the transition conference occurring late, however the State verified that these 2 children/families received a transition conference and plan with appropriate steps and services prior to exiting Part C.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

In each case of noncompliance, the Co-Leads notified the EIS program in writing concerning the finding of noncompliance and the requirement that the noncompliance be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year from identification. The State verified that each EIS program not in compliance correctly implemented the specific regulatory requirement and ensured that all children exiting Part C received a transition conference prior to exiting Part C. Each EIS program was required to develop and implement a Corrective Action Plan to ensure correction of noncompliance within one year. The Co-Leads monitored the implementation of the Corrective Action Plan. In addition, the Co-Leads reviewed different files of children exiting Part C for assurance that compliance was met and the CAP-related processes, as well as specific regulatory requirements, were implemented. Within one year of identification each EIS program was found to be in 100% compliance.

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

Each EIS program was required to develop and implement a Corrective Action Plan to ensure correction of noncompliance within one year. The Co-Leads monitored the implementation of the Corrective Action Plan. In addition, the Co-Leads reviewed additional files of children exiting Part C for assurance that compliance was met and the CAP-related processes, as well as specific regulatory requirements, were implemented. Within one year of identification each EIS program was found to be in 100% compliance. In the regions where transition conferences did not occur within regulated timelines, the Co-Leads provided targeted technical assistance. The requirements and appropriate documentation of transition conferences for children exiting Part C will continue to be a training topic to ensure that all EIS programs correctly implement the specific regulatory requirements and have strategies in place to ensure compliance. The state has verified that each EIS program is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and ensured, for the 2 children in which noncompliance was found and who had not yet exited Part C, these children/families received a transition conference prior to exiting Part C.

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data:

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥						

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/12/2013	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/12/2013	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

3.1 Number of resolution sessions	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
0	0			

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

--

Indicator 10: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥						

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Prepopulated Data

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

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
0	0	0			

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

--

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Baseline Data

FFY	2013
Data	

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target					

Description of Measure

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Data Analysis

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

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

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

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

FFY 2013 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

Statement

Description

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

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

Theory of Action

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

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted



Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

This indicator is not applicable.