

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

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

**For reporting on
FFY18**

AMERICAN SAMOA PART C PROGRAM



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

This Annual Performance Report (APR) describes how the American Samoa (AS) Part C program, under the American Samoa Department of Health, carried out early intervention services for zero to three population with special needs during the reporting period of July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019. The AS Part C program maintains a unitary system and its Lead Agency is the Department of Health. There is only one Part C program who is both the State and Local for the territory of American Samoa who staffs 6 government employees (2 who are EI providers) and 4 contracted specialists (Occupational, Physical, Speech therapist, and a psychologist). This APR was put together collaboratively by the Part C stakeholders and then submitted to its Interagency Coordinating Council for their review and certification.

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 American Samoa Early Intervention Program submitted its General Supervision systems document to OSEP in previous SPP/APR submissions and should be on file.

Technical Assistance System:

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

The American Samoa Part C Program continues to receive technical assistance primarily from its OSEP contact as well as OSEP funded projects with data collections, data analysis, and the use of data to implement evidenced based practices for the improvement of child and family outcomes. These TA centers include the IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy) and the Early Childhood TA center (ECTA). In addition, these TA centers have provided extensive support to the American Samoa's efforts to the continued development and implementation of its SSIP through monthly calls providing direct TA and providing various training resources towards SSIP activities. A year ago there was a change in leadership in the American Samoa Part C Program. Along with the OSEP contact person, and the TA centers, the fairly new Program Coordinator, Roseanne Felise, continues to receive support and guidance in preparation for the APR from the former Program Coordinator, Ruth Te'o, when needed.

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 American Samoa Early Intervention program employs an SSIP coordinator who works closely with the TA centers in the development and implementation of its SSIP through monthly calls and various training resources towards SSIP activities. The SSIP Coordinator is following the comprehensive developmental system that was formalized and updated utilizing evidence based practices.

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 development of the American Samoa Part C program's targets for its State Performance Plan was a collaborative effort by its stakeholders who reviewed existing data to determine where potential revisions might be needed. Stakeholders include the following agencies: Helping Babies hear, Maternal and Child Health program, Zika program, Children with Special Needs program, Home visit program, Parent Support Group, Department of Human and Social Services, and the Department of Education. The AS Part C program with support from its Lead Agency maintains weekly meetings with its core stakeholder group and monthly meetings with its broader stakeholder group where data is shared with the group on program target performance. Stakeholder's meetings also consist of ongoing discussions around improving overall services across agencies for families and their children with special needs especially families enrolled in multiple programs within the stakeholder group.

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.

The American Samoa Part C Program Annual Performance Report is available on its website under Resources, Reports and Documents. Also, through public service announcements the public will be informed that the AS Part C FFY 2018 SPP/APR will be available for public viewing in its office and through its Lead Agency and posted on its website once updates are completed.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

Intro - OSEP Response

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

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

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

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Baseline | 2005 | 87.00% | | | |
| FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

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 |
|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 46 | 46 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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.

0

Include your State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

The American Samoa Part C Program's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services is 30 days from the IFSP start date. Every child who received an IFSP receives early intervention services within 30 days of the IFSP start date. As noted above, this reporting period of July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019 there were 0 documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances. AS Part C program continues to provide services to meet every child and families availability as well as provide compensatory services.

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

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

July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019

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

During the reporting period of July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, a total of 46 children were found eligible for early intervention services (EI) and received an IFSP. All 44 children eligible for EI services received EI services in a timely manner. As noted above, there are no documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

If needed, provide additional information about this indicator here.

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 |

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

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 |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

1 - OSEP Response

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 | 60.00% | | | |
|----------|---------|---------|--------|---------|---------|
| FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Target>= | 95.10% | 95.20% | 95.30% | 95.40% | 95.50% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 97.14% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|----------|--------|--------|
| Target>= | 95.60% | 95.60% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The development of the American Samoa Part C program's targets for its State Performance Plan was a collaborative effort by its stakeholders who reviewed existing data to determine where potential revisions might be needed. Stakeholders include the following agencies: Helping Babies hear, Maternal and Child Health program, Zika program, Children with Special Needs program, Home visit program, Parent Support Group, Department of Human and Social Services, and the Department of Education. The AS Part C program with support from its Lead Agency maintains weekly meetings with its core stakeholder group and monthly meetings with its broader stakeholder group where data is shared with the group on program target performance. Stakeholder's meetings also consist of ongoing discussions around improving overall services across agencies for families and their children with special needs especially families enrolled in multiple programs within the stakeholder group.

The APR will be publicly disseminated in printed materials and will be placed in the American Samoa Early Intervention office and the American Samoa Department of Health office. The APR report will report to the public on (1) American Samoa's progress and/or slippage in meeting the "measurable and rigorous targets" found in the State Performance Plan (SPP) and (2) the performance of the American Samoa Part C program on the targets in the SSIP.

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 | 38 |
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/10/2019 | Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs | 38 |

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 |
|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 38 | 38 | 100.00% | 95.60% | 100.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

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

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

Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3 - Indicator Data

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The development of the American Samoa Part C program's targets for its State Performance Plan was a collaborative effort by its stakeholders who reviewed existing data to determine where potential revisions might be needed. Stakeholders include the following agencies: Helping Babies hear, Maternal and Child Health program, Zika program, Children with Special Needs program, Home visit program, Parent Support Group, Department of Human and Social Services, and the Department of Education. The AS Part C program with support from its Lead Agency maintains weekly meetings with its core stakeholder group and monthly meetings with its broader stakeholder group where data is shared with the group on program target performance. Stakeholder's meetings also consist of ongoing discussions around improving overall services across agencies for families and their children with special needs especially families enrolled in multiple programs within the stakeholder group.

Historical Data

| | Baseline | FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|----|----------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| A1 | 2012 | Target>= | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| A1 | 100.00% | Data | 100.00% | 93.10% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| A2 | 2012 | Target>= | 91.01% | 91.01% | 91.03% | 91.04% | 91.05% |
| A2 | 91.00% | Data | 88.10% | 80.00% | 100.00% | 72.00% | 100.00% |
| B1 | 2012 | Target>= | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| B1 | 100.00% | Data | 100.00% | 94.12% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| B2 | 2012 | Target>= | 87.01% | 87.02% | 87.03% | 87.04% | 87.05% |
| B2 | 87.00% | Data | 88.37% | 80.00% | 93.75% | 76.00% | 93.75% |
| C1 | 2012 | Target>= | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| C1 | 100.00% | Data | 100.00% | 94.29% | 93.75% | 100.00% | 93.75% |
| C2 | 2012 | Target>= | 87.01% | 87.02% | 87.03% | 87.04% | 87.05% |
| C2 | 87.00% | Data | 85.71% | 80.00% | 93.75% | 80.00% | 93.75% |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|-------------|---------|---------|
| Target A1>= | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| Target A2>= | 91.06% | 91.06% |
| Target B1>= | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| Target B2>= | 87.06% | 87.06% |
| Target C1>= | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| Target C2>= | 87.06% | 87.06% |

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

24

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

| | Number of children | Percentage of Total |
|---|--------------------|---------------------|
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 3 | 12.50% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0.00% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 3 | 12.50% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 18 | 75.00% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0.00% |

| | 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 | 21 | 24 | 100.00% | 100.00% | 87.50% | Did Not Meet Target | 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 | 18 | 24 | 100.00% | 91.06% | 75.00% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable

The American Samoa Part C program during the reporting period of July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019 conducted regular team meetings where each child that received an IFSP was rated using the Child Outcomes Summary process at entry and when exited. The data reported here represents kids who received early intervention services for 6 months or more. Each child's COS rating was determined by using standardized tools, professional findings, as well as family input on their child's progress or performance at entry and exit.

The data reported includes kids referred to the AS Part C program late (i.e referred between 24 to 33 months) not allowing for sufficient time with the Part C program to provide early intervention services to yield significant improvement to the level of age expectation. Data also includes kids with significant limitations as a result of their disability and although their performance outcome scores improved, they were not at age expectation.

The AS Part C program continues to aggressively promote early intervention in the community increasing awareness of EI services through various public service announcements for early identification prior to the age of 2 years old. Additionally, the AS Part C program continues its efforts to educate the community/parents through television appearances on the importance of early intervention.

Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable

Reasons for slippage are the same as Outcome A1. Please see below:

The American Samoa Part C program during the reporting period of July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019 conducted regular team meetings where each child that received an IFSP was rated using the Child Outcomes Summary process at entry and when exited. The data reported here represents kids who received early intervention services for 6 months or more. Each child's COS rating was determined by using standardized tools, professional findings, as well as family input on their child's progress or performance at entry and exit.

The data reported includes kids referred to the AS Part C program late (i.e referred between 24 to 33 months) not allowing for sufficient time with the Part C program to provide early intervention services to yield significant improvement to the level of age expectation. Data also includes kids with significant limitations as a result of their disability and although their performance outcome scores improved, they were not at age expectation.

The AS Part C program continues to aggressively promote early intervention in the community increasing awareness of EI services through various public service announcements for early identification prior to the age of 2 years old. Additionally, the AS Part C continues its efforts to educate the community/parents through television appearances on the importance of early intervention.

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 | 2 | 8.33% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0.00% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 2 | 8.33% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 20 | 83.33% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0.00% |

| | 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 | 22 | 24 | 100.00% | 100.00% | 91.67% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----|----|--------|--------|--------|---------------------|----------|
| B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 20 | 24 | 93.75% | 87.06% | 83.33% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
|--|----|----|--------|--------|--------|---------------------|----------|

Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable

Reason for slippage is the same as Outcome A. Please see below:

The American Samoa Part C program during the reporting period of July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019 conducted regular team meetings where each child that received an IFSP was rated using the Child Outcomes Summary process at entry and when exited. The data reported here represents kids who received early intervention services for 6 months or more. Each child's COS rating was determined by using standardized tools, professional findings, as well as family input on their child's progress or performance at entry and exit.

The data reported includes kids referred to the AS Part C program late (i.e referred between 24 to 33 months) not allowing for sufficient time with the Part C program to provide early intervention services to yield significant improvement to the level of age expectation. Data also includes kids with significant limitations as a result of their disability and although their performance outcome scores improved, they were not at age expectation.

The AS Part C program continues to aggressively promote early intervention in the community increasing awareness of EI services through various public service announcements for early identification prior to the age of 2 years old. Additionally, the AS Part C continues its efforts to educate the community/parents through television appearances on the importance of early intervention.

Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable

Reason for slippage is the same as Outcome A. Please see below:

The American Samoa Part C program during the reporting period of July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019 conducted regular team meetings where each child that received an IFSP was rated using the Child Outcomes Summary process at entry and when exited. The data reported here represents kids who received early intervention services for 6 months or more. Each child's COS rating was determined by using standardized tools, professional findings, as well as family input on their child's progress or performance at entry and exit.

The data reported includes kids referred to the AS Part C program late (i.e referred between 24 to 33 months) not allowing for sufficient time with the Part C program to provide early intervention services to yield significant improvement to the level of age expectation. Data also includes kids with significant limitations as a result of their disability and although their performance outcome scores improved, they were not at age expectation.

The AS Part C program continues to aggressively promote early intervention in the community increasing awareness of EI services through various public service announcements for early identification prior to the age of 2 years old. Additionally, the AS Part C continues its efforts to educate the community/parents through television appearances on the importance of early intervention.

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 | 0 | 0.00% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 2 | 8.33% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 2 | 8.33% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 20 | 83.33% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0.00% |

| | 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 | 22 | 24 | 93.75% | 100.00% | 91.67% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 20 | 24 | 93.75% | 87.06% | 83.33% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable

Reason for slippage is the same as Outcome A and B. Please see below:

The American Samoa Part C program during the reporting period of July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019 conducted regular team meetings where each child that received an IFSP was rated using the Child Outcomes Summary process at entry and when exited. The data reported here represents kids who received early intervention services for 6 months or more. Each child's COS rating was determined by using standardized tools, professional findings, as well as family input on their child's progress or performance at entry and exit.

The data reported includes kids referred to the AS Part C program late (i.e referred between 24 to 33 months) not allowing for sufficient time with the Part C program to provide early intervention services to yield significant improvement to the level of age expectation. Data also includes kids with significant limitations as a result of their disability and although their performance outcome scores improved, they were not at age expectation.

The AS Part C program continues to aggressively promote early intervention in the community increasing awareness of EI services through various public service announcements for early identification prior to the age of 2 years old. Additionally, the AS Part C continues its efforts to educate the community/parents through television appearances on the importance of early intervention.

Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable

Reason for slippage is the same as Outcome A and B. Please see below:

The American Samoa Part C program during the reporting period of July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019 conducted regular team meetings where each child that received an IFSP was rated using the Child Outcomes Summary process at entry and when exited. The data reported here represents kids who received early intervention services for 6 months or more. Each child's COS rating was determined by using standardized tools, professional findings, as well as family input on their child's progress or performance at entry and exit.

The data reported includes kids referred to the AS Part C program late (i.e referred between 24 to 33 months) not allowing for sufficient time with the Part C program to provide early intervention services to yield significant improvement to the level of age expectation. Data also includes kids with significant limitations as a result of their disability and although their performance outcome scores improved, they were not at age expectation.

The AS Part C program continues to aggressively promote early intervention in the community increasing awareness of EI services through various public service announcements for early identification prior to the age of 2 years old. Additionally, the AS Part C continues its efforts to educate the community/parents through television appearances on the importance of early intervention.

Will your separate report be just the at-risk infants and toddlers or aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C?

XXX

Historical Data

| | Baseline | FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|-------|----------|----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| A1 | XXX | Target>= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| A1 | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| A1 AR | XXX | Target>= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| A1 AR | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| A2 | XXX | Target>= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| A2 | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| A2 AR | XXX | Target>= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| A2 AR | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| B1 | XXX | Target>= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| B1 | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| B1 AR | XXX | Target>= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| B1 AR | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| B2 | XXX | Target>= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| B2 | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| B2 AR | XXX | Target>= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| B2 AR | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| C1 | XXX | Target>= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| C1 | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-----|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| C1 AR | XXX | Target >= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| C1 AR | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| C2 | XXX | Target >= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| C2 | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| C2 AR | XXX | Target >= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| C2 AR | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Target A1 >= | XXX | XXX |
| A1 AR | XXX | |
| Target A2 >= | XXX | XXX |
| A2 AR | XXX | XXX |
| Target B1 >= | XXX | XXX |
| B1 AR | XXX | XXX |
| Target B2 >= | XXX | XXX |
| B2 AR | XXX | XXX |
| Target C1 >= | XXX | XXX |
| C1 AR | XXX | XXX |
| Target C2 >= | XXX | XXX |
| C2 AR | XXX | XXX |

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

XXX

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

| Not including at-risk infants and toddlers | Number of children | Percentage of Total |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | XXX | XXX |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | XXX | XXX |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |

| Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers | Number of children | Percentage of Total |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | XXX | XXX |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | XXX | XXX |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |

| Not including at-risk infants and toddlers | 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 | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| 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 | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

| Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers | 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 | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| 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 | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

Provide reasons for A1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for A2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

| Not including at-risk infants and toddlers | Number of Children | Percentage of Total |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | XXX | XXX |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | XXX | XXX |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |

| Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers | Number of Children | Percentage of Total |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | XXX | XXX |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |

| | | |
|--|-----|-----|
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | XXX | XXX |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |

| Not including at-risk infants and toddlers | 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 | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| 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 | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

| Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers | 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 | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| 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 | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

Provide reasons for B1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for B2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

| Not including at-risk infants and toddlers | Number of Children | Percentage of Total |
|---|--------------------|---------------------|
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | XXX | XXX |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | XXX | XXX |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |

| Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers | Number of Children | Percentage of Total |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | XXX | XXX |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | XXX | XXX |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |

| Not including at-risk infants and toddlers | 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 | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| 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 | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

| Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers | 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 | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| 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 | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

Provide reasons for C1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for C2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

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 | 38 |
| 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. | 14 |

| | Yes / No |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| Was sampling used? | NO |

| | |
|--|--|
| Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? | |
| If the plan has changed, please provide sampling plan. | |

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

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

YES

Provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.”

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

The ECO Child Outcomes Summary Form, Outcomes Rating Scale, and Outcomes rating Calculation.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3 - OSEP Response

3 - Required Actions

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

4 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

| | Baseline | FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---|----------|-----------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|
| A | 2006 | Target >= | 85.10% | 85.20% | 85.30% | 85.40% | 85.50% |
| A | 67.70% | Data | 93.33% | 83.33% | 95.83% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| B | 2006 | Target >= | 83.10% | 83.20% | 83.30% | 83.40% | 83.50% |
| B | 61.30% | Data | 95.56% | 91.67% | 95.83% | 94.44% | 100.00% |
| C | 2006 | Target >= | 83.10% | 83.20% | 83.30% | 83.40% | 83.50% |
| C | 80.60% | Data | 95.56% | 91.67% | 100.00% | 94.44% | 100.00% |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|-------------|--------|--------|
| Target A >= | 85.60% | 85.60% |
| Target B >= | 83.60% | 83.60% |
| Target C >= | 83.60% | 83.60% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The development of the American Samoa Part C program's targets for its State Performance Plan was a collaborative effort by its stakeholders who reviewed existing data to determine where potential revisions might be needed. Stakeholders include the following agencies: Helping Babies hear, Maternal and Child Health program, Zika program, Children with Special Needs program, Home visit program, Parent Support Group, Department of Human and Social Services, and the Department of Education. The AS Part C program with support from its Lead Agency maintains weekly meetings with its core stakeholder group and monthly meetings with its broader stakeholder group where data is shared with the group on program target

performance. Stakeholder's meetings also consist of ongoing discussions around improving overall services across agencies for families and their children with special needs especially families enrolled in multiple programs within the stakeholder group.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

| | |
|---|----|
| The number of families to whom surveys were distributed | 38 |
| Number of respondent families participating in Part C | 19 |
| A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 19 |
| A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 19 |
| 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 | 19 |
| B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | 19 |
| 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 | 19 |
| C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn | 19 |

| | 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) | 100.00% | 85.60% | 100.00% | 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) | 100.00% | 83.60% | 100.00% | 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) | 100.00% | 83.60% | 100.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

Provide reasons for part A slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for part B slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for part C slippage, if applicable

XXX

| | Yes / No |
|---|----------|
| Was sampling used? | NO |
| If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? | |
| If the plan has changed, please provide the sampling plan. | |

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

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

If not, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

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.

This reporting period, the American Samoa Part C program decided to continue to conduct surveys over the phone. In previous years, when surveys were given to parents there was a high number of returned surveys with multiple answers circled for the same questions, discrediting those surveys.

The ECO Family Outcomes Survey was utilized. In person or phone surveys are feasible survey distribution methods for families of clients receiving Part 19Part C

C services often do not have personal postal boxes because they are unable to pay for a postal box. American Samoa only has one post office where all mail is sent and received. The American Samoa (AS) Part C Program therefore, has over the years solicited partner agencies assistance to conduct in person or over the phone surveys. This method, although not always effective with most families opting not to complete the surveys, has yield a better return compared to mailing surveys.

Those surveyed were families of children who have exited the AS Part C program during this reporting period and who received Part C services for at least 6 months. All families who met this criteria was contacted by our surveyors to request their participation in the surveys. Surveys are conducted at the end of each month as families meeting this criteria exit the program. The AS Part C program provides services throughout the island, therefore the number is representative of different districts, villages, and races/ethnicities, every served by the AS Part C program. Additionally, those surveys is representative of families of kids with various disabilities including children who are born premature and being monitored for potential developmental delays.

During this reporting period, a total of 38 children exited the AS Part C services and 24 of those kids were in Part C for 6 or more months. Those 24 families were contacted and 19 were successfully surveyed and completed. Some of the reasons for the unsuccessful contact attempts range from disconnected phone numbers or not returned calls.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

4 - OSEP Response

4 - Required Actions

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

| Baseline | 2013 | 0.98% | | | |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Target >= | 0.98% | 0.99% | 1.00% | 1.01% | 1.02% |
| Data | 0.98% | 0.92% | 0.95% | 0.89% | 0.10% |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|-----------|-------|-------|
| Target >= | 1.03% | 1.03% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The development of the American Samoa Part C program's targets for its State Performance Plan was a collaborative effort by its stakeholders who reviewed existing data to determine where potential revisions might be needed. Stakeholders include the following agencies: Helping Babies hear, Maternal and Child Health program, Zika program, Children with Special Needs program, Home visit program, Parent Support Group, Department of Human and Social Services, and the Department of Education. The AS Part C program with support from its Lead Agency maintains weekly meetings with its core stakeholder group and monthly meetings with its broader stakeholder group where data is shared with the group on program target performance. Stakeholder's meetings also consist of ongoing discussions around improving overall services across agencies for families and their children with special needs especially families enrolled in multiple programs within the stakeholder group.

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 | 4 |
| 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 | 916 |

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 |
|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 4 | 916 | 0.10% | 1.03% | 0.44% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Compare your results to the national data

The AS Part C program during the reporting period July 1, 2018 to June 30th 2019, mostly received referrals of toddlers in the age group 2 to 3 years old. Although the AS Part C program did not meet the target for FFY 2018 or the national data, the AS part C program continues its daily Child Find efforts in the community Health Clinics, the territorial hospital, through Child Care Facilities, community Health Fairs, various public announcements, and through its stakeholders.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

AS Part C Program collected birth count from the American Samoa Hearing Screening Program who collects all live births data from the territory's hospital (LBJ Tropical Medical Center) and verifies all births in the territory. The total live births for 2018 is 916 which is the number that is listed above.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

| Baseline | 2013 | 1.28% | | | |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Target >= | 1.28% | 1.29% | 1.30% | 1.31% | 1.32% |
| Data | 1.28% | 0.93% | 1.06% | 1.34% | 0.82% |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|-----------|-------|-------|
| Target >= | 1.33% | 1.33% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The development of the American Samoa Part C program's targets for its State Performance Plan was a collaborative effort by its stakeholders who reviewed existing data to determine where potential revisions might be needed. Stakeholders include the following agencies: Helping Babies hear, Maternal and Child Health program, Zika program, Children with Special Needs program, Home visit program, Parent Support Group, Department of Human and Social Services, and the Department of Education. The AS Part C program with support from its Lead Agency maintains weekly meetings with its core stakeholder group and monthly meetings with its broader stakeholder group where data is shared with the group on program target performance. Stakeholder's meetings also consist of ongoing discussions around improving overall services across agencies for families and their children with special needs especially families enrolled in multiple programs within the stakeholder group.

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 | 38 |
| 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 | 3,978 |

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 |
|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 38 | 3,978 | 0.82% | 1.33% | 0.96% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Compare your results to the national data

As previously noted, the AS Part C Program collects its live births from the AS Newborn Hearing Screening who collects live birth from the territorial hospital. The alternate data added is from the total live births for the years 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018.

Although 38 infants and toddlers had IFSPs at the time of the 618 report submission, it should be noted that through the year the AS Part C Program provides services for more than 60 clients as referral coming in as well as kids who are being monitored by the AS Part C Program for being at risk for developmental delays. At any given time, kids on the monitor list can become eligible for EI services after re-evaluation is completed and if results determine child needs an IFSP and family accepts services. The monitor list is maintained by the Part C program as an attempt to prevent lost to follow up as much as possible.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 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 | 81.00% | | | |
|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|--------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

| 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 |
|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| 31 | 33 | 100.00% | 100% | 96.97% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

A total of 33 infant and toddlers were evaluated and assessed for whom an IFSP meeting was required to be conducted. Of the 33 children requiring an IFSP meeting, 31 had an IFSP meeting conducted within Part C's 45-Day timeline. As noted above, there is 1 documented delay attributable to exceptional family circumstances. Reasons include family requesting to reschedule due to family forgetting about scheduled visit, family emergencies, and multiple no shows.

The slippage is due to 1 documented delay attributable to staff circumstances. The child-find coordinator accidentally re-entered a referral with the wrong date generating a second 45-day deadline. This was immediately identified and a corrective supervision meeting between staff and management team was conducted. AS Part C program management along with their database developer were able to remove the duplicated referral entry and the 45-day deadline was corrected. Unfortunately, by the time this issue was resolved, the family had already agreed to schedule evaluation on a date that was after the 45-day deadline. Nevertheless, early intervention services were resumed to meet child and family availability.

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.

1

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

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

JULY 1, 2018 TO JUNE 30, 2019

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

This data is extracted from the AS Part C's web-based database using a customized report that includes all infants and toddlers referred to Part C during the reporting period of July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019. Data from this report includes but are not limited to referral dates and IFSP dates for each child referred during this period.

A total of 33 infant and toddlers were evaluated and assessed for whom an IFSP meeting was required to be conducted. Of the 33 children requiring an IFSP meeting, 31 had an IFSP meeting conducted within Part C's 45-Day timeline. As noted above, there is 1 documented delay attributable to exceptional family circumstances. Reasons include family requesting to reschedule due to family forgetting about scheduled visit, family emergencies, and multiple no shows. However, early intervention services were resumed to meet child and families availability.

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 |

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

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 |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

7 - OSEP Response

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

| Baseline | 2005 | 92.00% | | | |
|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|--------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

If no, please explain.

| 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 |
|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| 22 | 25 | 100.00% | 100% | 96.00% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

During the reporting period of July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, 25 toddlers with disabilities exited the AS Part C program. Of the 25 children who exited, 22 had an IFSP with transition steps and services. As noted below, there are 2 documented delays due to child being referred to the AS Part C Program late (i.e. child was referred to AS Part C program at 32 months). However, the AS Part C program was able to provide services to meet child and families availability.

The AS Part C program continues to aggressively promote early intervention in the community increasing awareness of EI services through various public service announcements for early identification prior to the age of 2 years old. Additionally, the AS Part C continues its efforts to educate the community/parents through television appearances on the importance of early intervention.

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.

2

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

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

JULY 1, 2018 TO JUNE 30, 2019

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

The AS Part C utilizes its web-based database to extract customized reports that includes data on each child that exited Part C during the reporting period of July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019 who should have had an IFSP with transition steps and services. For the reporting period of July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, 22 infants and toddlers exiting the AS Part C program had an IFSP with transition steps and services. As noted above, there are 2 documented delays due to child being referred to AS Part C program late (i.e. child was referred to AS Part C program at 32 months old). However, AS Part C program was able to provide child with transition steps and services before child exited the AS Part C program.

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 |

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

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 |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

8A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

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:

- 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.

8B - Indicator Data

Historical Data

| Baseline | 2005 | 100.00% | | | |
|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|--------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

YES

If no, please explain.

| 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 |
|---|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 23 | 23 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of parents who opted out

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

0

Describe the method used to collect these data

Data was collected in Sate Database and verified with child files and documentation completed by families who received early intervention services during reporting period.

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

NO

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

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

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

JULY 1, 2018 TO JUNE 30, 2019

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

Data during this reporting period was extracted from the AS Part C website of all kids exiting Part C with IFSPs potentially eligible for transition services. Child records were verified and confirmed using data reports extracted from the programs's database.

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 |

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

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 |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

8B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8B - OSEP Response

8B - Required Actions

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the numbers 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 | 64.00% | | | |
|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|--------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Data 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

If no, please explain.

| Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties 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 |
|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| 20 | 23 | 100.00% | 100% | 95.65% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

A total of 23 toddlers who were potentially eligible for Part B exited AS Part C program in the reporting period of July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019. Of the exited 23 children who were potentially eligible for Part B, 20 children had their transition conference occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday. As noted below, there are 2 documented delay attributable to exceptional family circumstances. Reasons include late referral to the AS Part C program (i.e. child was referred to AS Part C at 32 months old), family requesting to reschedule due to family forgetting about scheduled visit, family emergencies, and multiple no shows.

The slippage is due to 1 documented delay attributable to staff circumstances. The child-find coordinator, who is responsible for coordinating transitions, received this referral when family referred child at 30 months old. In the process of coordinating transition with the child's family, Child-Find coordinator had to go on a family emergency leave. Upon return, 90 days for transition ended. This was immediately identified and a corrective supervision meeting between staff and management team was conducted. Transition services for child and family was scheduled and completed and services resumed to meet child and families availability.

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.

2

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

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

JULY 1, 2018 TO JUNE 30, 2019

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

Data was extracted from the program's website and utilized to verify documentation in client records. As noted above, there are 2 documented delays due to child being referred by family late to AS Part C program (child referred at 32 months old). One other delay is due to program staff delay of scheduling due to taking family emergency leave. Nevertheless, the AS Part C program was able to conduct transition conference with these children before exiting the program.

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 |

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

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 |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

8C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

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.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Select yes to use target ranges.

Target Range not used

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

NO

Provide an explanation below.

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data |
|---|------------|--|------|
| SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/11/2019 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 0 |
| SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/11/2019 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 0 |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The development of the American Samoa Part C program's targets for its State Performance Plan was a collaborative effort by its stakeholders who reviewed existing data to determine where potential revisions might be needed. Stakeholders include the following agencies: Helping Babies hear, Maternal and Child Health program, Zika program, Children with Special Needs program, Home visit program, Parent Support Group, Department of Human and Social Services, and the Department of Education. The AS Part C program with support from its Lead Agency maintains weekly meetings with its core stakeholder group and monthly meetings with its broader stakeholder group where data is shared with the group on program target performance. Stakeholder's meetings also consist of ongoing discussions around improving overall services across agencies for families and their children with special needs especially families enrolled in multiple programs within the stakeholder group.

An Annual Performance Report (APR) task group was formed to assist the Lead Agency in the development of the APR. The members of the APR task force is comprised of stakeholders including a representative from the local parent group organization, the Executive Director of the Developmental Disabilities Planning Council, community members, the transition specialist from the Special Education Program, Head Start disabilities specialist, Part C Coordinator, Part C Program Manager and Part C Data Manager.

The APR task group worked collaboratively with the Lead Agency and reported to the Interagency Coordinating Council. The Interagency Council reviewed information from the APR task group and provided additional assistance to the Lead Agency. The draft APR, as developed, was shared and reviewed with the Interagency Coordinating Council. Additional stakeholder input was obtained through meetings with parents, local providers, and other interested participants.

The APR will be publicly disseminated in printed materials and will be placed in the American Samoa Early Intervention office and the American Samoa Department of Health office. The APR will report to the public on (1) American Samoa's progress and/or slippage in meeting the "measurable and rigorous targets" found in the States Performance Plan (SPP) and (2) the performance of the American Samoa Part C program on the targets in the SPP.

Historical Data

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Baseline | | | | | |
| FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Target>= | | | | | |
| Data | | | | | |

Targets

| | | |
|------------|-------------|-------------|
| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
| Target>= | | |

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

| 3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 3.1 Number of resolutions sessions | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|---|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| 0 | 0 | | | | N/A | N/A |

Targets

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

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

| 3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 3.1 Number of resolutions sessions | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target (low) | FFY 2018 Target (high) | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|---|----------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The AS Part C program has not received a due process hearing request to fully adjudicate.

The AS Part C program continues it's quarterly trainings with Part C staff on policies and procedures in place to support staff/providers in educating parents of their rights and all requirements related to due process. Additionally, chart reviews are conducted by the AS Part C administrative team monthly to collect data on parents receiving correct notice of parents rights and all requirements related to due process.

The AS Part C also refers parents to the local Parent Information and Training Network for additional support with understanding their child's rights under IDEA.

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

9 - OSEP Response

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 ED Facts 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

Provide an explanation below

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 development of the American Samoa Part C program's targets for its State Performance Plan was a collaborative effort by its stakeholders who reviewed existing data to determine where potential revisions might be needed. Stakeholders include the following agencies: Helping Babies hear, Maternal and Child Health program, Zika program, Children with Special Needs program, Home visit program, Parent Support Group, Department of Human and Social Services, and the Department of Education. The AS Part C program with support from its Lead Agency maintains weekly meetings with its core stakeholder group and monthly meetings with its broader stakeholder group where data is shared with the group on program target performance. Stakeholder's meetings also consist of ongoing discussions around improving overall services across agencies for families and their children with special needs especially families enrolled in multiple programs within the stakeholder group.

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 | 2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not | 2.1 Number of mediations held | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|-----|-----|
| due process complaints | related to due process complaints | | | | | | |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | N/A | N/A |

Targets

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

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 (low) | FFY 2018 Target (high) | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

10 - OSEP Response

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

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:

Motusa Tuileama Nua

Title:

Department of Health Director

Email:

tuinua@doh.as

Phone:

684-633-7676

Submitted on: