

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The Lead Agency for Part C in Michigan is the State Education Agency, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE). Since program inception, the early intervention system has coordinated and collaborated with the Department of Human Services (DHS), the child well-being agency, and the Department of Community Health (DCH), which houses both mental health and public health, to implement the early intervention system for infants and toddlers with disabilities or developmental delays and their families.

The APR development process included input from partner agencies, data collected by various contractors, and a review by the Michigan Interagency Coordinating Council (MICC). Individual contractors are assigned responsibility for indicator-specific data. A series of meetings with partner agencies and contractors, both together and individually, were held to review and analyze data and develop appropriate activities. The data coordination meetings helped to align work and decrease redundancy of efforts.

Once the initial draft of the APR was completed, one staff member at MDE was assigned to coordinate the completion of the document. MDE staff and contractors reviewed each indicator using the provided APR Checklist. An enhanced draft of the APR was shared with the MICC in November for input and discussion. Suggestions were reviewed and, where appropriate, integrated into the document.

In 2005, Michigan Part C engaged in activities to determine how to redesign the early intervention system to better support infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. National technical assistance was contracted to support the State with this process. Lessons learned through the redesign process provide direction for system improvements that are described throughout the APR. Michigan learned that:

- 1) A significant portion of the cost of the system is supported by Michigan Special Education state and local funds;
- 2) Michigan Part C/*Early On*[®] needed a more comprehensive and flexible data system;
- 3) The interagency agreement/contract needs to delineate roles and responsibilities of each partner agency; and
- 4) Coordination of early intervention resources requires the support of interagency administration.

Michigan is a birth mandate state; eligible children are entitled to special education services from birth to 26 years of age. During the redesign process, it was learned that state and local special education funds provide over \$40 million annually to the early intervention system. Given the significant role Michigan Special Education plays in *Early On*, a more enhanced relationship with local special education systems has occurred. MDE staff participates in a monthly conference call with special education directors. In addition, MDE staff representing both the Part C and Special Education systems meet monthly to discuss system issues.

The need for a more flexible and comprehensive data system became more apparent with time. The Michigan Part C data system was originally built to respond to the point-in-time 618 data collection requirements. Refinements to the general supervision system and the State Performance Plan (SPP) requirements increased the need for additional data. *Early On* migrated to a web-based data system in December 2008, which includes additional data fields to collect SPP information. This will decrease the need for site-based file reviews to gather data to address SPP requirements and to make and verify correction of findings of noncompliance. Adding fields to a web-based data collection system is approximately a three year process. One year is required to program and pilot the changes. Another year is needed to train staff and provide technical assistance to get valid and reliable data. Finally, in the third year, data will be available for reporting. Michigan's upgraded data collection system will collect all data needed for completing the APR, except for Family Outcomes and the due process information.

Interagency coordination and collaboration has been a philosophy of the state of Michigan for many years. During the redesign process, the changing roles and responsibilities of the partner agencies became evident. It was decided to redesign the management structure and to complete a new interagency contractual agreement with agency roles and responsibilities more delineated and specific.

It has also become clear that Michigan's system of general supervision must be refined and the relevant timelines aligned. In Michigan, Parts B and C have been involved in the development of a more comprehensive monitoring system (CIMS-2). The monitoring system has gone through various iterations to respond to the changes mandated as a result of the 2004 Reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act. There are three components to CIMS-2: (1) Focused Monitoring; (2) Data Analysis, which includes a process for notifying local early intervention programs of findings which require corrective action plans for compliance indicators and improvement plans for results indicators; and (3) Verification. Additional assistance to local programs is provided by local regional monitoring staff on how to correct for individual noncompliance and how to develop practices to assure ongoing compliance. Verification that each local early intervention services program is correctly implementing a specific regulatory requirement starts with MDE requesting that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever is greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the federal and state standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. The focused monitoring component of CIMS-2 has been implemented and the data analysis portion of CIMS-2 began April 2009. A pilot program for the validation process took place in September 2009, allowing seven pilot sites to verify specific data points in the CIMS-2 system. All local early intervention programs now participate in the validation process through the CIMS-2 system.

The revised Michigan Part C of IDEA SPP can be downloaded at www.michigan.gov/earlyon.

Public Reporting

FFY 2009 public reporting on the performance of each local early intervention service program on the required indicators was posted on MDE's website: www.michigan.gov/earlyon. Data was shared with the stakeholder group, the MICC, and activities discussed with various advisory subgroups. Prior to release, local programs were asked to review their data. After the various reviews, a media advisory was released by MDE's Office of Communications directing stakeholders to the site.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 1: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

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.

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009:

97.83%

Data were collected in the Michigan Electronic Grants System (MEGS) through a local self-assessment. Local early intervention programs were required to select a random representative sample of children. Local early intervention programs were required to sample 10% of their snapshot number or a minimum of 10 records, whichever was greater. The records were a representative sample chosen from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010.

Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who Receive Early Intervention Services in a Timely Manner:

a. Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	587
b. Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	600
Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner (Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100)	97.83%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2009:

Michigan has defined timely services as the provision of services within 30 calendar days from when a parent/guardian consents to the provision of early intervention services. During FFY 2009, **97.83%** of infants and toddlers with IFSPs had all early intervention services on their IFSPs initiated within 30 calendar days of parent consent to the services.

The decrease in performance rate in FFY 2009 as compared to FFY 2008 (100%) may be attributed to a number of factors. Michigan's early intervention system has had several new staff members enter into the system. Early intervention programs have a better understanding of the requirements of Indicator 1. In addition, the early intervention programs have a better understanding of exceptional family circumstances.

During FFY 2009, Michigan continued updating the Michigan Part C data system to include the collection of data regarding providing services in a timely manner; details of Michigan's progress with the upgrades are provided in the discussion of the planned improvement activities in this indicator. In order to collect data for this indicator, the whole state submitted data in a local self-assessment using MEGS.

Michigan did not meet the target of 100% compliance on this indicator. Through self assessment, details on exceptional family circumstances were recorded and included in the FFY 2009 calculation. Of the 22 children who did not receive the services on their IFSP in a timely manner, nine had exceptional family circumstances documented in the file. They included requests from parents to wait on services, hospitalization of children, and parents not home. The 13 children who did not have timely services initiated and did not have an exceptional family circumstance received the services indicated on their IFSPs. As part of the local self-assessment in MEGS, early intervention programs were asked to document the causes for the delay. Staff unavailable or sick was the reason in all instances for a delay in

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

the timely start of the child's services. In addition, as part of the local self-assessment in MEGS, early intervention programs had to indicate whether the child received services and in all cases the child did receive the services indicated on his/her IFSP.

Five local early intervention programs were issued findings in FFY 2009 and each had to submit, for approval, a corrective action plan in the CIMS-2 system that detailed strategies that the local early intervention program would take to correct noncompliance, as soon as possible, but no later than one year from notification of the finding, including verification by the State. As part of the corrective action planning process, progress reports were submitted. Local early intervention programs were provided assistance by local regional monitors to develop corrective action plans and correct individual and systemic noncompliance. Progress reports required the local early intervention program to conduct file reviews. When progress reports indicated compliance or that a state target had been met, MDE required early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency for verification of correction of noncompliance. A sample of records was sent to MDE and MDE used a checklist to verify correction of noncompliance.

MDE requested that the local early intervention program identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever was greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon federal and state standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. Verification involves review of a sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1).

Local early intervention programs are notified of the outcome of verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter. The collection of exceptional family circumstances helps compliance with this indicator. Another reason for progress in this indicator is the training and technical assistance provided by the State and the training entity.

In order to maintain compliance, MDE will continue providing technical assistance through online trainings through MDE's Comprehensive System of Professional Development (CSPD) contractor. In addition, MDE will monitor data to assure that local early intervention programs that are found to be in noncompliance write and implement corrective action plans.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2008 for this indicator: 100%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2008 (the period from July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009)	0
2. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State verified as timely corrected (verified as corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	0
3. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

4. Number of FFY 2008 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	0
6. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

There were no findings of noncompliance.

Verification of Correction of FFY 2008 noncompliance or FFY 2008 findings (either timely or subsequent):

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 1.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008:

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 1.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):

All local early intervention programs that were issued findings in FFY 2007 have corrected noncompliance. Reporting on all local early intervention programs issued findings for Indicator 1, were reported as corrected in the FFY 2008 APR.

Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 findings:

All local early intervention programs issued findings in FFY 2007 for Indicator 1 have been corrected and reported as corrected in the FFY 2008 APR.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007:

All findings of noncompliance were corrected and evidence was provided in the FFY 2008 APR.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2006 or Earlier (if applicable):

All findings of noncompliance have been verified and correction has taken place. All findings from FFY 2006 or earlier were reported as corrected in the FFY 2008 APR.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

N/A

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2009:

The following activities were included in the FFY 2008 APR and in the SPP that was updated in February 2010. An update on the progress of each activity is included.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
<p>Activity: The Michigan Part C data system will be upgraded to ensure timely and accurate collection of utilization and outcome data for <i>Early On</i>.</p>	<p>2006-2008 Completed</p>	<p>Part C Administrative Structure Michigan Part C data system contractor</p>
<p>Discussion: The Michigan Part C data system upgrades moved forward during the reporting period and continue at the time of this report; all 57 local early intervention programs have moved to the upgraded system. Updates to the Michigan Part C data system were made to include the actual start date of each new service listed on the initial and subsequent IFSPs. In addition, the system also collects data related to exceptional family circumstances. This will allow Michigan to notify local early intervention programs of findings in a more timely manner, report data from all 57 local early intervention programs for this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR, better analyze reasons for noncompliance, and provide additional data about the local early intervention programs.</p> <p>For the FFY 2009 APR, to be submitted in February 2011, data for this indicator were collected through the Michigan Electronic Grants System (MEGS).</p> <p>The process of upgrading the Michigan Part C data system has been time and resource consuming at the state and local levels. Adding fields to a web-based data collection system is approximately a three year process. One year is required to program and pilot the changes. Another year is needed to train staff and provide technical assistance to get valid and reliable data. Finally, in the third year, data will be available for reporting. Michigan expects to use data from the new system for the FFY 2010 APR submitted in 2012.</p>		
<p>Activity: Develop policies and procedures regarding the State's definition around the 30-day definition of timely services.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>MDE staff</p>
<p>Discussion: Prior to FFY 2006, the term 'timely services' had not been defined for Part C in Michigan. Therefore, local early intervention programs were not necessarily initiating services within 30 days of receiving parental consent or documenting service initiation that did occur within 30 days. A draft <i>Timely Services Reference Bulletin</i> was distributed in December 2006 explaining the new requirements. The proposed policy change went out for formal public comment in October 2007. The final policy was enacted in summer 2008.</p> <p>The <i>Timely Services Reference Bulletin</i> also includes information regarding exceptional family circumstances. Personnel have been informed that an exceptional family circumstance must be family driven and documented in the child's record. With proper documentation and data entry, reviewers will be able to verify whether the delay in initiation of services was family driven, and thus justifiable.</p>		
<p>Activity: Provide trainings to the field around exceptional circumstances, timely services and correct documentation for both.</p>	<p>Throughout 2007 Ongoing</p>	<p>CSPD contractor</p>
<p>Discussion: The CSPD contractor continues to provide guidance to the field around the provision and documentation of timely services and exceptional family circumstances. The new tiered system of CSPD was implemented in 2007 with local early intervention programs receiving determinations of Needs Assistance being targeted by the CSPD contractor, and local early intervention programs receiving determinations of Needs Intervention targeted by MDE consultants. In 2009, local early intervention programs that received a Needs Assistance determination were required to contact the CSPD contractor. Local early intervention programs that received a Needs Assistance 2 (received a Needs Assistance determination for two years in a row) determination were required to specify, with a justification and measurable results, specific technical assistance that they utilized. Local early intervention programs that received a Needs Intervention determination will seek technical assistance from the State.</p> <p>No local early intervention programs were issued findings in 2010. Trainings were available for all local early intervention programs via online and in person.</p>		

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Activity: Develop Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for training and technical assistance, and child find and public awareness contracts.	Completed May 2007	Interagency staff
Activity: Award training and technical assistance, and child find and public awareness contracts.	Completed October 2007	MDE staff
Discussion: The RFPs for training and technical assistance, and child find and public awareness were developed and awarded in October 2007. The revised systems began October 1, 2007. The previous CSPD contractor was again awarded both the training and technical assistance and the child find and public awareness contracts with changes made based on <i>Early On</i> Redesign, funding decreases, the SPP, and system needs.		
Activity: Recommendations from the <i>Early On</i> Redesign will be incorporated into the SPP.	Completed	<i>Early On</i> Redesign staff Local early intervention programs CSPD contractor
Discussion: Improvement activities identified through the Redesign process have been incorporated throughout the SPP and APR.		
Activity: Analyze data measuring this indicator and develop additional improvement activities.	Ongoing with annual review through 2012	Interagency staff Part C contractors MICC Stakeholders
Discussion: As evidenced in the APR, analysis of data from multiple sources related to the SPP indicators helped Michigan identify issues within the field that need additional guidance or dialogue and to plan opportunities related to the indicators and Michigan's system of general supervision in order to correct noncompliance.		
Activity: Update and redistribute the Reference Bulletin regarding the definition of 'central file' and what documents are required to be a part of that file.	Fall 2008 Completed	MDE staff CSPD contractor Michigan Part C data system contractor
Discussion: The analysis of available data demonstrates the need for clarification to the field on exactly what is required to be included in each child's central file. The requirement to keep documentation of services provided and any exceptional family circumstances in the central file will positively impact compliance with this indicator.		
Activity: Refine and clearly define the Part C general supervision system.	Summer 2008 Completed	MDE staff [Office of Early Childhood Education & Family Services (ECE&FS) and the Office of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (OSE/EIS)] CIMS contractor North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) Data Accountability Center (DAC)
Discussion: As described in the Overview of the APR, Michigan is working with national TTA experts to streamline its system of general supervision to more promptly and efficiently identify and correct findings of noncompliance. In August 2008, NCRRC and DAC visited Michigan to develop a paper regarding Michigan's Part C General Supervision system. Michigan presented at a conference for early intervention coordinators in Michigan in October explaining Michigan's General Supervision system.		
Activity: Require each of the 57 local early intervention programs to utilize the Michigan State prototype IFSP, IFSP/IEP, Transition, Consent to Evaluate, and Authorization to Share forms or submit the locally-developed form(s) for State approval.	Summer 2008 Completed	MDE staff Interagency staff CSPD contractor Michigan Part C data system contractor
Discussion: Requiring local early intervention programs to use State prototype or approved forms will ensure that the required fields are available on every form, making it more likely that all necessary information will be available, and will ease the transition for families moving within the state. Local early intervention programs were required in the July 2008 application to specify whether they would use the State prototype or locally developed forms. If the local early intervention program indicated they would be using their own forms, MDE used a checklist to ensure that all components that were required were present. Notification to the local early intervention program occurred after MDE's check.		

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

<p>Activity: Increase communication with ISD Special Education Directors through a planned stakeholder group and attendance at their quarterly meetings.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>MDE staff (ECE&FS and OSE/EIS) CIMS contractor</p>
<p>Discussion: Most local <i>Early On</i> Coordinators are supervised by the ISD Special Education Director. Additionally, Michigan Special Education, birth to three years, is the largest provider of services to children enrolled in Part C. Therefore it is vitally important that ISD Special Education Directors understand the Part C requirements and are involved in decision-making as stakeholders. Increased communication with ISD Special Education Directors will both improve their understanding of Part C regulations and policies and increase MDE staff members' understanding of the interrelationship between Part C and Michigan Special Education.</p>		
<p>Activity: Develop guidance on determining which services are <i>Early On</i> services versus which are 'other' services.</p>	<p>Winter 2008 Ongoing</p>	<p>MDE staff Interagency staff NCRRC National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC)</p>
<p>Discussion: In Michigan, services available to children birth to three years, whether enrolled in Part C or not, through state or local partners are not considered Part C services when the partners refuse to meet Part C regulations. Because best practice dictates that these services be coordinated through Part C, they are included on the IFSP as 'other' services. Record reviews, focused monitoring visits, and personal discussions have revealed that there are varying interpretations across the state about what is an <i>Early On</i> service versus what is an 'other' service. Clarifying this confusion will help ensure the correct completion of IFSPs and the collection of data on <i>Early On</i> services.</p>		
<p>Activity: Update Michigan's Part C data system to include dates parental consent was obtained and when services actually began.</p>	<p>2009 Completed</p>	<p>MDE staff Michigan Part C data system</p>
<p>Discussion: In FFY 2009, Michigan added a field to its data system to accurately account for timely services. Training began in FFY 2009 and will continue. Beginning July 1, 2010, all local early intervention programs are required to enter these data into the data system. The FFY 2010 APR will use the Michigan data system to collect this information.</p>		
<p>Activity: Add component in the CIMS system to validate data entered into Michigan's Part C data system.</p>	<p>2010-2012</p>	<p>MDE staff CIMS contractor</p>
<p>Discussion: Beginning in FFY 2009, CIMS added a component to allow local early intervention programs to validate data. In FFY 2009, pilot sites were chosen to complete this activity. Beginning in FFY 2010, all local early intervention programs are required to complete validation activities through CIMS.</p>		
<p>Activity: Update Michigan's Part C data system to allow local early intervention systems to enter exceptional family circumstances.</p>	<p>2010-2012</p>	<p>MDE staff Michigan Part C data system</p>
<p>Discussion: Beginning in FFY 2009, one of the fields available in Michigan's data system was added, that being the reason for late services. Local early intervention programs are required to enter this field as of July 1, 2010.</p>		
<p>Activity: Update Michigan's Part C data system to allow local early intervention programs to generate reports to indicate when timelines need to be met.</p>	<p>2010-2012</p>	<p>MDE staff Michigan Part C data system</p>
<p>Discussion: The Michigan Part C data system allows local early intervention programs to generate reports for a variety of activities. Local early intervention programs can create lists for timelines. This will help local early intervention programs with compliance indicators.</p>		
<p>Activity: Train local early intervention programs to use all components of Michigan's Part C data system.</p>	<p>2010-ongoing</p>	<p>MDE staff Michigan Part C data system</p>
<p>Discussion: Training local early intervention programs on the new components of the Part C data system as well as CIMS will allow the programs to utilize the enhancements to ensure compliance.</p>		

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan
State

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2010:

No revisions at this time.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See page 1 of this APR.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments

Indicator 2: 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)

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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	92%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009: 94.31%

In FFY 2009, **94.31%** of infants and toddlers with IFSPs primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings = 10,057
 Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs = 10,663
 10,057 divided by 10,663 = 0.9431 X 100 = 94.31%
 Data source: Michigan Part C data system, December 2009 collection

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2009:

	12/1/02	12/1/03	12/1/04	12/1/05	12/1/06	12/1/07	12/1/08	12/1/09
% of infants and toddlers who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.	76.82%	77.46%	84.41%	84.2%	88.1%	92.41%	93.31%	94.31%

Data source: Michigan Part C data system, December 2009 collection

Michigan Part C FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

N/A

FFY 2006 Findings

Of the four local early intervention programs that had findings related to the percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings, all corrected within one year.

FFY 2007 Findings

No findings for FFY 2007 for this indicator were made.

FFY 2008 Findings

No findings for FFY 2008 for this indicator were made.

Progress/Slippage

In FFY 2009, Michigan exceeded its target of 92% with 94.31% for this indicator. Michigan used the 618 reporting data that were due February 1, 2009. Progress on this indicator can be attributed to the training modules that are available through MDE’s CSPD contractor. The training modules helped local early intervention programs understand the definition of natural environment. In addition, training on providing individualized justifications when services were not provided in the natural environment assisted local early intervention programs to understand the requirements of this SPP/APR indicator. The training modules, as well as training on data entry, assisted local early intervention programs to enter correct data for reporting. To help local early intervention programs to continue meeting and/or exceeding the State target, MDE and its CSPD contractor will continue training on this indicator.

Improvement Activities:

Michigan made progress and exceeded its target of 93%. The following activities will occur to ensure at least 93% of infants and toddlers in Michigan receive services in the home or community-based settings. An update on the progress of each activity is included.

Improvement Activity	Timelines	Resources
Activity: Focused Monitoring Follow Up	Ongoing	MDE
Discussion: Four service areas received focused monitoring and a report from MDE stating areas of concern. At the follow up visit, each service area had met or exceeded its target. All service areas that had findings in this area have corrected them.		
Activity: The Michigan Part C data system will be upgraded to ensure timely and accurate collection of utilization and outcome data for <i>Early On</i> .	2006-2012 Ongoing Completed	Part C Administrative Structure Michigan Part C data system contractor
<p>Discussion: The Michigan Part C data system upgrades moved forward during the reporting period and continue at the time of this report; as of the December 1, 2008 618 count, all 57 service areas are utilizing the upgraded system. Updates to the Michigan Part C data system have been made to include actual start date of each new service listed on the initial and subsequent IFSPs. Coding has been added for natural environments data to allow service areas to identify whether services were provided in the home, community setting, or other. In addition, the system also collects data related to exceptional family circumstances. This will allow Michigan to notify service areas of findings in a more timely manner, report data from all 57 service areas for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, better analyze reasons for noncompliance, and provide additional data about the local service areas.</p> <p>The process of upgrading the Michigan Part C data system has been time and resource consuming at the state and local levels. Adding fields to a web-based data collection system is approximately a three year process. One year is required to program and pilot the changes. Another year is needed to train staff and provide technical assistance to get valid and reliable data. Data will be available for reporting in FFY 2009 APR.</p> <p>For the FFY 2009 APR, to be submitted in February 2011, data for this indicator were collected through the Michigan Part C data system.</p>		
Activity: Training and technical assistance on the provision of natural environments will be continued by the CSPD contractor to incorporate elements from the <i>Implementation Guide to Natural Environments</i> into their	Ongoing	CSPD contractor Michigan Part C data system contractor Interagency staff

APR Template – Part C (4)

trainings. The training's effectiveness will be measured through pre- and post-tests for training participants through the CSPD system. Amendments to the training will be made based on results achieved.		
Discussion: The CSPD contractor continued to provide training and technical assistance on the provision of services in the natural environment, especially to low-performing service areas. The contractor shared the <i>Implementation Guide</i> with local early intervention programs and it is posted on their website.		
Activity: The data dictionary continues to be revised and training will occur.	Ongoing	Michigan Part C data system contractor Interagency staff
Discussion: The data dictionary is updated on a regular basis. The Michigan Part C data system has been aligned with OSEP 618 requirements and is being upgraded to meet SPP data needs.		
Activity: Training will occur around the common definition of services provided in the natural environment, documentation, and how to report it through data collection.	Ongoing	CSPD contractor
Discussion: The CSPD contractor continued to provide training and technical assistance on the provision of services in the natural environment, especially to low-performing service areas. Additionally, the contractor developed a training and technical assistance module specifically targeted to this indicator and its related requirements.		
Activity: Develop Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for training and technical assistance, and child find and public awareness contracts.	Completed May 2007	Interagency staff
Activity: Award training and technical assistance, and child find and public awareness contracts.	Completed October 2007	MDE
Discussion: The RFPs for training and technical assistance, and child find and public awareness were developed and awarded during the reporting period. The revised systems began October 1, 2007. The previous CSPD contractor was again awarded both the training and technical assistance and the child find and public awareness contracts with changes made based on <i>Early On Redesign</i> , funding decreases, the SPP, and system needs.		
Activity: Analyze data measuring this indicator and develop additional improvement activities.	Ongoing with annual review through 2012	Interagency staff Part C contractors MICC Stakeholders
Discussion: As evidenced in the APR, analysis of data from multiple sources related to the SPP indicators has led to the development of additional, more targeted, improvement activities.		
Activity: Require each of the 57 local service areas to utilize the Michigan State Prototype IFSP, IFSP/IEP, Transition, Consent to Evaluate, and Authorization to Share forms or submit the locally-developed form(s) for State approval.	Summer 2008 Completed	CSPD contractor MDE staff
Discussion: The 57 local early intervention programs were required to either use the Michigan State prototype forms or submit their locally-developed forms. Requiring local early intervention programs to use the prototype forms or their approved forms ensures that all required components are present, including a justification when services are not provided in the natural environment.		
Activity: Increase communication with ISD Special Education Directors through monthly conference calls, a planned stakeholder group, and attendance at their quarterly meetings.	Ongoing	MDE staff (ECE&FS and OSE/EIS) ISD Special Education Directors <i>Early On</i> local coordinators
Discussion: Staff participate in the monthly Special Education Directors calls. This ensures that any questions or updates are being received at the Special Education Director level.		
Activity: Require local early intervention programs not meeting compliance or performance targets to contact and accept guidance from Michigan's training and technical assistance providers.	Ongoing	CSPD contractor

Discussion: As part of findings and determinations, those service areas that are not substantially in compliance, and thus receiving a finding and a Needs Assistance determination or Needs Intervention determination, must work with Michigan’s technical assistance providers. Michigan’s technical assistance providers assist the local early intervention programs to create improvement plans and therefore increase compliance.		
Activity: The CSPD contractor will review the new training and technical assistance module on natural environments to ensure that all related requirements are included in the training.	Completed	CSPD contractor Grant manager
Discussion: Michigan’s personnel development system has reviewed and made changes to the natural environments module to include more in-depth training on when and why services are not held in the natural environment.		
Activity: Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS-2)	Ongoing	CIMS contractor MDE
Discussion: CIMS-2 is being updated to better align with the APR. CIMS-2 will become a data analysis tool which will allow early intervention programs to analyze causes for not meeting State targets.		

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2010:

Improvement Activity	Timelines	Resources
Activity: The PTI grantee, Michigan Alliance for Families, will create and disseminate mini-folders to parents whose children are enrolled in Part C.	2010-ongoing	Michigan PTI grantee Parent Involvement Committee (PIC) MDE staff
Discussion: Mini-folders are being developed around topics such as IFSP, natural environments, family rights, and transition. These mini-folders will be shared with parents in small groups in informal gatherings, allowing time to answer questions and explain the materials. This activity replicates the support provided to Part B families. Drafts of the mini-folders were shared in June 2010 with the PIC and feedback was given. Revisions will be made and shared with the PIC when completed. The mini-folders will allow the parent mentors to have a set of documents that guide a structured introductory conversation about Child and Family Outcomes, IFSPs, natural environments, family rights and/or transition to use with families in <i>Early On</i> .		

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See page 1 of this APR.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 3: 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)

Measurement:

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

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):
 - 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.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

- 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.
- 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 the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- 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 the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- 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 the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- 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 the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

New Reporting Requirements
For each indicator, also report on the following Summary Statements:

Summary Statement 1
Of those infants and toddlers who entered Part C below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who **substantially increased** their rate of growth by the time they exited = [(c+d) divided by (a+b+c+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 exited = [(d+e) divided by (a+b+c+d+e)] times 100.

Target Data and Actual Target Data for FFY 2009:

Targets and Actual Data for Part C Children Exiting in FFY 2009 (2009-2010)

Summary Statements	Targets FFY 2009 (% of children)	Actual FFY 2009 (% of children)
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)		
1. 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 exited the program	74.5%	76.4%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program	59.4%	63.4%
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)		
1. 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 exited the program	79.0%	80.7%

2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they exited the program	53.8%	58.8%
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		
1. 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 exited the program	78.3%	80.0%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they exited the program	59.4%	61.7%

Progress Data for Part C Children FFY 2009

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	12	.4%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	543	16.2%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	674	20.0%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,121	33.4%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,006	30.0%
Total	N=3,356	100%
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	8	.3%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	526	15.7%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	847	25.2%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,384	41.2%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	591	17.6%
Total	N=3,356	100%
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	9	.3%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	528	15.7%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	748	22.3%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1401	41.7%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	670	20.0%
Total	N=3,356	100%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The State continued the progress in developing its outcome measurement system over the past year:

1. Data Collection Procedures

- Review of Assessment Tools. Two committees were convened to examine assessment/measurement tools. Each committee included stakeholders from across Michigan's Part C system, *Early On*. One committee met as a part of the *Early On* Redesign Eligibility Determination Task Force and recommended tools appropriate for: (1) eligibility determination; (2) needs assessment/IFSP development; and (3) ongoing assessment/child outcomes measurement. A second committee was convened to evaluate potential tools to accurately and appropriately measure children's social-emotional status. The recommendations of both committees were incorporated into a list of tools provided to local service areas.
- Development of a Procedures Handbook. A policy and procedures handbook was developed to clarify all aspects of data collection in reporting on child outcomes measurements. The handbook incorporates information about a ratings tool and process, appropriate measurement tools, other data sources, frequency of data collection, the population of children to be included, and timelines for measuring child outcomes. As changes in policy and/or procedures occur, the handbook will be updated accordingly. Typical measurement tools used across the state include: Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System for Infants and Children (AEPS); Battelle Developmental Inventory; Bayley Scales of Infant Development, III; Early Intervention Developmental Profile (EIDP); Early Learning Accomplishment Profile (E-LAP); Hawaii Early Learning Profiles (HELP); The Carolina Curriculum for Infants and Toddlers with Special Needs; Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development; Infant and Toddler Developmental Assessment (IDA); and the Devereux Early Childhood Assessment for Infants and Toddlers (DECA-I/T). Since FFY 2008, Child Outcome Summary Forms (COSFs) are not required for children who enter Part C at age 30 months and older.
- Adoption of a Rating Tool. A child outcomes rating tool, COSF, was developed; it is patterned closely on the ECO Center Child Outcomes Summary Form and also defines 'comparable to same age peers' as a child who has been scored a 6 or 7 on the COSF. As the data sources/assessment tools will vary across Michigan's 57 local service areas, this tool is being used to summarize data for each child. It captures both entry and progress data. Service providers can use the tool to capture data from many sources, including the child's assessment, observations, and parent input. Data collection will typically occur during the child's IFSP development meetings, and during the transition process. The data are then entered on the COSF website. The COSF aligns closely with the form used by 619 to collect outcomes data.

2. Training/Supporting Service Areas

- A Training and Technical Assistance program continues to address the child outcomes data collection process. The Qualitative Compliance Information Project (QCIP) provided a component of the training to address the use of the COSF and web-based data entry procedures. The training closely reflected the content of the Child Outcomes Handbook. Michigan's CSPD contractor also provided a training component discussing best practices for including parents (and other individuals chosen by the parents) in the process. Both components were provided in collaboration with State interagency staff to create shared responsibility, knowledge, and coordination across all levels of the system.

3. Sampling Plan – Phase In

- Data collection did proceed according to the sampling plan previously submitted to OSEP. Cohort 1, which includes a representative sample of one-third of the 57 local service areas, began collecting entry data on all children enrolled in *Early On* as of July 1, 2006 and exit data for any child exiting *Early On* who has been receiving services continuously for six months. Cohort 2 began collecting entry data on all children enrolled as of July 1, 2007 and exit data for any child who has been receiving services continuously for six months. Cohort 3 began collecting entry data on all children enrolled as of July 1, 2008 and exit data for any child who has been receiving

services continuously for six months. This is the second year that Michigan has all service areas providing child outcome data.

4. Data Collection and Management and Data Quality Assurance

- All data from the child outcomes rating tool are entered into a web-based data entry system, with a copy of the rating tool retained in the child's central record. The data system includes the following variables:
 - Date summary form completed
 - Timeframe for which the data were collected (Entry, Exit, Exceptional Circumstance)
 - 1-7 point rating for each of the three child outcomes
 - Assessment of progress (for Exit)

In addition, upgrades to the data entry system included error-check features, ensuring quality data. The system catches errors or impossible data before data entry is completed, preventing inaccurate data from being entered. Error messages inform data entry personnel when incorrect data are being entered, including impossible assessment dates, incorrect COSF rating dates, or invalid rating on whether the child has shown new skills since the entry COSF rating.

- Data Auditing. The online COSF data are regularly audited, including names, dates, and impossible progress ratings. COSF rating dates are compared to IFSP signature dates to ensure that all children were entered during the required time period and exited after participating in Part C for a minimum of six months. In order to eliminate and reduce error, the web-based COSF requires entry for all fields except for the children's middle initials. Data entry personnel are prevented from proceeding to the next section of the website until all data are entered.
- Period Count Verifications. The QCIP coordinated with service area staff to acquire a list of children for whom they are responsible for entering data for the data collection period. If discrepancies were found, the QCIP worked closely with each of the service areas to go over the list of children. QCIP staff also helped local service areas to identify extreme circumstances and documented these cases in the online system.
- Human Subjects Protection. The QCIP developed procedures for the web-based data entry system to ensure human subjects protection and data security, including: (a) a list of approved users are allowed access to the online COSF system; (b) the online COSF system limits the operation time to 15 minutes per section - if there is no server activity for 15 minutes, it will time-out so as to protect child information from unapproved passers-by; (c) all data transmitted and received by the QCIP research team are encrypted using Secure Sockets Layer (SSL) technology; and (d) the web-based COSF data are saved as a secure Microsoft SQL database on the QCIP research team's server, accessible only to key personnel who have received Wayne State University's Human Investigation Committee's Human Subjects approval.

Data for FFY 2006 (July 1, 2006 - June 30, 2007) – Former Baseline Data

- A new data collection method was implemented, using the COSF adapted from the ECO Center's COSF. In the FFY 2004 SPP, Michigan submitted a sampling plan to be used for the pilot study for early childhood outcomes. This plan divided the 57 service areas into three representative cohorts. OSEP approved this plan.
- For FFY 2006, Cohort 1, one-third of the 57 service areas, began collecting entry data on all children enrolling in Part C as of July 1, 2006 and progress data on any of those children exiting by June 30, 2007 who had received services continuously for at least six months.

Data for FFY 2007 (July 1, 2007 - June 30, 2008)

- For FFY 2007, Cohort 1 continued with data collection and Cohort 2 began collecting entry data on all children enrolling in Part C as of July 1, 2007 and progress data on any of those children exiting by June 30, 2008 who had received services continuously for at least six months.

Data for FFY 2008 (July 1, 2008 - June 30, 2009) - New Baseline Data, Per New Reporting Requirements

- For FFY 2008, Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 are continuing data collection and Cohort 3 began collecting entry data on all children enrolling in Part C as of July 1, 2008 and progress data on any of those children exiting by June 30, 2009 who had received services continuously for at least six months.

Data for FFY 2009 (July 1, 2009 - June 30, 2010)

- For FFY 2009, the three cohorts collected entry data on all children enrolling in Part C as of July 1, 2009 and progress data on any of those children exiting by June 30, 2010 who had received services continuously for at least six months.

Entry Results

During FFY 2009, entry data were collected for 7,361 children.

Children enrolling in Part C/Early On during FFY 2009 most frequently showed delays in the areas of Acquisition/Use of Knowledge and Skills (79.7%) and Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs (77.1%), with somewhat fewer children showing delays in Positive Social-Emotional Skills (66.2%). See Table 1 below.

Table 1: Part C/Early On Child Outcomes - FFY 2009 Entry Results

	SPP3A Social-Emotional		SPP3B Acquisition/Use of Knowledge		SPP3C Use of Appropriate Behaviors	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Comparable to same-aged peers (Entry rating of 6 or 7)	2,489	33.8%	1,496	20.3%	1,685	22.9%
Below same-aged peers (Entry rating of 1-5)	4,872	66.2%	5,865	79.7%	5,676	77.1%
TOTAL	7,361	100%	7,361	100%	7,361	100%

Progress Results – Five Progress Categories

For FFY 2009, there were 3,356 COSFs across the 57 service areas for children with entry data and who exited by June 30, 2010 after receiving services for a minimum of six continuous months. Tables 2 to 4 display the results for each of the three indicators along the five progress categories.

Table 2: Part C/Early On Child Outcomes - FFY 2009 Progress Results for **Positive Social-Emotional Skills**

Percent of infants and toddlers who:	Number	Percent
a. Did not improve functioning.	12	.4%
b. Improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	543	16.2%
c. Improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	674	20.0%
d. Improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	1,121	33.4%
e. Maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	1,006	30.0%
TOTAL	3,356	100%

Table 3: Part C/Early On Child Outcomes - FFY 2009 Progress Results for **Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills**

Percent of infants and toddlers who:	Number	Percent
a. Did not improve functioning.	8	.3%
b. Improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	526	15.7%
c. Improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	847	25.2%
d. Improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	1,384	41.2%
e. Maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	591	17.6%
TOTAL	3,356	100%

Table 4: Part C/Early On Child Outcomes - FFY 2009 Progress Results for **Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs**

Percent of infants and toddlers who:	Number	Percent
a. Did not improve functioning.	9	.3%
b. Improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	528	15.7%
c. Improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	748	22.3%
d. Improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	1,401	41.7%
e. Maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	670	20.0%
TOTAL	3,356	100%

Progress Results – Summary Statements

Table 5 below presents the progress results, using the required summary statements.

Table 5: Part C Child Outcomes – FFY 2009 Summary Statement

	Summary Statement 1	Summary Statement 2
Description	Of those infants and toddlers who entered Part C below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited.	The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they exited.
Measurement	[(c+d) divided by (a+b+c+d)] times 100	[(d+e) divided by (a+b+c+d+e)] times 100
SPP 3A: Social Emotional	76.4% [(674+1,121)÷(12+543+674+1,121)] X 100%	63.4% [(1,121+1006)÷3,356] X 100%
SPP 3B: Knowledge Acquisition	80.7% [(847+1,384)÷(8+526+847+1,384)] X 100%	58.8% [(1,384+591)÷3,356] X 100%
SPP 3C: Appropriate Behaviors	80.0% [(748+1,401)÷(7+530+748+1,401)] X 100%	61.7% [(1,401+670)÷3,356] X 100%

Discussion of Progress Data - FFY 2009:

The sample from which the progress data is drawn is not a representative sample, nor was it expected to be representative during the early years of data collection. As the sampling plan is implemented and data collection moves along into year five (FFY 2010), it will be appropriate to expect that the sample will be

representative of both the children enrolled in Part C/*Early On* and of the demographics of the state. We have noted the following from our fourth year's **progress** data:

- Overall, the FFY 2009 data indicate that children enrolled in Part C/*Early On* (n=3,356) improved functioning across the three outcomes, with greater than half achieving or maintaining functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers for each of the three outcomes (categories d and e):

Summary Statement 2

- Positive Social-Emotional Skills: 63.4%
 - Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills: 58.8%
 - Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs: 61.7%
- Positive Social-Emotional Skills:*
 - The overwhelming majority of children in the sample are making developmental progress during their enrollment in Part C/*Early On* (i.e., categories b through e; 99.6%, n =3,344);
 - Over half of the sample changed their developmental trajectories and closed the gap between their development and that of same-aged peers without delays (categories c and d; 53.4%, n=1,795); and
 - About three-fifths (63.4%) either reached or maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers and are thus 'ready' for the next steps in their lives (categories d and e; n=2,127).
 - Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills:*
 - 99.7% of the children in the sample improved functioning during their enrollment in Part C/*Early On* (categories b through e; n=3,348);
 - More than two-thirds of the children changed their developmental trajectories and closed the gap between their development and that of same-aged peers without delays (categories c and d; 66.4%, n=2,231); and
 - The majority reached or maintained functioning comparable with their same-aged peers (categories d and e; 1,975, or 58.8%).
 - Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs:*
 - 99.7% of the children in the sample improved functioning in the area of Using Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs during their enrollment in Part C/*Early On* (categories b through e; n=3,347);
 - A majority of the children changed their developmental trajectories and closed the gap between their development and that of same-aged peers without delays (categories c and d; 64.0%, n=2,149); and
 - The majority achieved or maintained functioning comparable with their same-aged peers (categories d and e; n=2,071, or 61.7%).

Discussion of Data - FFY 2009:

Summary Statement 1: Overall, the data indicates that of those infants and toddlers enrolled in Part C/*Early On* **below age expectations** in each Outcome, **more than three-quarters substantially increased** their rate of growth by the time they exited.

- Positive Social-Emotional Skills: 76.4% (meets FFY 2009 target of 74.5%)
- Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills: 80.7% (meets FFY 2009 target of 79.0%)
- Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs: 80.0% (meets FFY 2009 target of 78.3%)

Summary Statement 2: Overall, the data indicates that **more than half** of infants and toddlers were **functioning within age expectations** in each Outcome by the time they exited.

- Positive Social-Emotional Skills: 63.4% (meets FFY 2009 target of 59.4%)
- Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills: 58.8% (meets FFY 2009 target of 53.8%)
- Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs: 61.7% (meets FFY 2009 target of 59.5%)

Discussion of Baseline Data:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	No target setting.
2006 (2006-2007)	No target setting.
2007 (2007-2008)	No target setting.
2008 (2008-2009)	<p><u>Baseline data: Summary Statement 1:</u> SPP 3A: 74.0% 76.2% SPP 3B: 79.1% 79.4% SPP 3C: 78.1% 79.4%</p> <p><u>Baseline data: Summary Statement 2:</u> SPP 3A: 59.2% 60.7% SPP 3B: 54.0% 51.1% SPP 3C: 59.4% 60.0%</p>
2009 (2009-2010)	<p><u>Target Set: Summary Statement 1:</u> SPP 3A: 74.5% SPP 3B: 79.0% SPP 3C: 78.3%</p> <p><u>Target Set: Summary Statement 2:</u> SPP 3A: 59.4% SPP 3B: 53.8% SPP 3C: 59.5%</p>
2010 (2010-2011)	<p><u>Target Set: Summary Statement 1:</u> SPP 3A: 74.8% SPP 3B: 79.3% SPP 3C: 78.6%</p> <p><u>Target Set: Summary Statement 2:</u> SPP 3A: 59.7% SPP 3B: 54.2% SPP 3C: 59.7%</p>

<p>2011 (2011-2012)</p>	<p><u>Target Set: Summary Statement 1:</u> SPP 3A: 74.8% SPP 3B: 79.3% SPP 3C: 78.6%</p> <p><u>Target Set: Summary Statement 2:</u> SPP 3A: 59.7% SPP 3B: 54.2% SPP 3C: 59.7%</p>
<p>2012 (2012-2013)</p>	<p><u>Target Set: Summary Statement 1:</u> SPP 3A: 74.8% SPP 3B: 79.3% SPP 3C: 78.6%</p> <p><u>Target Set: Summary Statement 2:</u> SPP 3A: 59.7% SPP 3B: 54.2% SPP 3C: 59.7%</p>

The following activities were included in the SPP that was updated in February 2009. An update on the progress of each activity is included.

Improvement Activity	Timelines	Resources
<p>Activity: A child outcomes rating tool will be implemented to capture both entry and progress data on all children who enter and exit in FFY 2006 after at least six months of service.</p>	<p>Completed</p> <p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Interagency staff Part C contractors Stakeholders</p>
<p>Discussion: The tool has been created and implemented. Initial data analysis, coupled with feedback from local service areas, identified several features that could be improved. Improvements are underway and their impact will be monitored during the upcoming years.</p>		
<p>Activity: A handbook has been distributed and used to clarify procedures and policy around gathering child outcomes ratings, including appropriate assessment tools, timeframes for collecting data, etc.</p>	<p>Completed</p> <p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Interagency staff Part C contractors Stakeholders</p>
<p>Discussion: The handbook is in use and has been modified several times to respond to questions and feedback from local users, information gained from NECTAC and the ECO Center, and resources from the Outcomes conference website. Improvements to the handbook will continue as implementation of our child outcomes data collection continues.</p>		
<p>Activity: Local service area personnel will be trained to use the new child outcomes rating tool, and in best practices to ensure that parents are included in establishing child outcomes ratings.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Interagency staff Part C contractors</p>
<p>Discussion: All 57 service areas have received training. The training protocol is being reviewed over the winter of 2008-2009 to integrate new materials from national resources and in response to questions and feedback from local users.</p>		

APR Template – Part C (4)

<p>Activity: Per the sampling plan submitted to OSEP, data collection on all children enrolling in <i>Early On</i> was phased in between July 1, 2006 and July 1, 2008. Cohort 1 began collecting and reporting child outcomes data during FFY 2006.</p>	<p>January-June 2007 and ongoing</p>	<p>Local service areas Part C contractors</p>
<p>Discussion: Implementation of the data collection plan is proceeding as anticipated, Cohort 3 started data collection July 1, 2008. Since July 2008, all 57 local early intervention programs have been collecting and reporting child outcomes data.</p>		
<p>Activity: FFY 2006 data will be submitted to the Part C contractor for processing and analysis.</p>	<p>Completed Ongoing</p>	<p>Local service areas Part C contractors</p>
<p>Discussion: Data analysis for 2006 is complete. Data submission will continue, with preliminary analysis and data cleaning on an ongoing basis, and full analysis of the 2008 sample beginning August 2009.</p>		
<p>Activity: The Michigan Part C data system will be upgraded to ensure timely and accurate collection of utilization and outcome data for <i>Early On</i>.</p>	<p>2006-2012 Ongoing Completed</p>	<p>Part C Administrative structure Michigan Part C data system contractor</p>
<p>Discussion: In addition to general Michigan Part C data system upgrades described under Indicator 1, updates to the data system will eventually include the collection of child outcomes data. This will eliminate duplicate data entry, provide a method for ensuring that child outcomes data are entered for every child in a timely manner, and enable Part C and 619 to align and utilize each other's child outcome data.</p>		
<p>Activity: Crosswalk Part C child outcomes with <i>Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infants and Toddlers (ECSQ-I/T)</i>, <i>Early Development and Learning Strands</i>, which were adopted by the Michigan State Board of Education on December 12, 2006.</p>	<p>Winter 2008 Completed</p>	<p>Interagency staff</p>
<p>Discussion: This activity will help Michigan demonstrate the connections between Part C outcomes and the State-adopted early learning standards. While originally scheduled for winter 2007, this had been postponed in order to work on other priorities related to compliance. The crosswalk has been completed and is in the process of department review. User guidance has been developed to accompany this alignment. Both documents are expected to be released to the field in 2011.</p>		
<p>Activity: Monitor data measuring this indicator and develop additional improvement activities to enhance the system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individually, to improve individual IFSPs based on results. • Locally, to improve local service area policy and procedures. • Statewide, to improve policy and program decision making, including personnel development. 	<p>2006-2010</p>	<p>Interagency staff Part C contractors MICC Stakeholders</p>
<p>Discussion: The child outcomes report will be shared with local service areas so that they can use it to support evaluation of their local systems. Likewise, the data will be presented to the MICC for discussion related to state-level improvements to <i>Early On</i>.</p>		
<p>Activity: Continue to utilize ECO Center and NECTAC resources as activities are implemented and results are reviewed.</p>	<p>2006-2010</p>	<p>Interagency staff Part C contractors</p>
<p>Discussion: Resources from the ECO Center and NECTAC have been very valuable as the child outcomes process has been implemented in Michigan. Such resources are continually reviewed and utilized to address questions and issues and to improve Michigan's process.</p>		

APR Template – Part C (4)

Activity: Continue to link with 619 child outcomes efforts to ensure efficiency, consistency and continuity in child outcomes data collection efforts.	2006-2010	Interagency staff Part C contractors
Discussion: Several conversations took place between Part C and 619 staff regarding child outcomes data collection in which information was shared about the successes of each process; procedures were developed for sharing child outcomes ratings at age three as children exit from <i>Early On</i> and enroll in 619. Additionally, meetings are planned for coordinating the switch to collecting child outcomes data through the Michigan Part C data system and the Michigan 619 data system.		
Activity: Distribute child outcomes report to local service areas for review and discussion.	Ongoing	Interagency staff Part C contractors
Discussion: A plan will be developed for sharing and discussing results of the first full year of child outcomes data collection in order to support greater understanding of the purpose and process, and support local system evaluation and development of local improvement activities. Our child outcomes data contractor held four meetings throughout the state in 2009, with local early intervention programs, to discuss child outcomes data.		
Activity: Improve system ability to predict how many and specifically which COSF forms should be entered into the data entry system.	Completed Spring 2008	Interagency staff Part C contractors Stakeholders
Discussion: During analysis of the FFY 2006 child outcomes data, a discrepancy was discovered between actual numbers of children reported for child outcomes by the service areas compared to the child count in the Michigan Part C data system. Therefore, it will be necessary to develop and implement a process to monitor that all expected child outcomes data are submitted correctly in a timely manner. The switch to using the Michigan Part C data system to collect the child outcomes data should greatly improve the reliability of the data collection.		
Activity: Clarify definition of and processes for system 'Exit.'	Completed Spring 2008	Interagency staff Stakeholders
Discussion: Implementation of the child outcomes data collection process has led to many questions about 'Exit' from Part C; clearly defining the term will help improve data in the state data collection system, improve transition and exit practices, and increase the accuracy of the child outcomes data.		
Activity: Develop procedures that support local early intervention programs to review and 'clean' their data prior to submission.	Spring 2008 Ongoing	Interagency staff Part C contractors
Discussion: Analysis of the FFY 2006 child outcomes data indicated there are many data errors that could potentially be identified and corrected locally, rather than after submission to the State contractor. Implementing a process for local review and correction, in conjunction with data cleaning for the entire data set, will inform and improve local child outcomes data collection efforts.		
Activity: Integrate the recommendations from two committees regarding appropriate assessment tools for eligibility determination and assessment to form a list of recommended tools for local service areas.	Completed Spring 2009	Interagency staff Part C contractors Stakeholders
Discussion: While two separate committees have convened and made recommendations regarding appropriate, evidence-based developmental assessment tools for both the eligibility determination and child outcomes rating process, the recommendations still need to be reviewed and integrated, followed by development of guidance and implementation.		

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2010:

N/A

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See page 1 of this APR.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments

Indicator 4: 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)

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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	A. Families know their rights – 70% B. Families effectively communicate their children’s needs – 67% C. Families help their children develop and learn – 89%

Actual Data for FFY 2009: A. 58%, B. 53%, C. 77%

The annual Part C/Early On Family Survey was adapted in FFY 2005 to include the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) “*Impact of Early Intervention Services on Your Family*” Scale and “*Family Centered Service*” Scale, as well as trend items linked with state and federal priorities. Data for the NCSEAM survey items were sent to Avatar International, LLC (NCSEAM-approved vendor) for analysis and reporting according to SPP requirements.

Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:	FFY 2005 Baseline	FFY 2006 Actual	FFY 2007 Actual	FFY 2008 Actual	FFY 2009 Actual
4A: Know their rights.	56% ¹ (SE of the mean = 1.0%) [1360 ² /2439 ³] x 100= 55.8%	58% ¹ (SE of the mean = 0.9%) [1577 ² /2703 ³] x 100= 58.3%	56% ¹ (SE of the mean = 0.9%) [1669 ² /2969 ³] x 100= 56.2%	58% ¹ (SE of the mean = 0.9%) [1724 ² /2981 ³] x 100= 57.8%	58% ¹ (SE of the mean = 0.9%) [1833 ² /3163 ³] x 100= 58.0%
4B: Effectively communicate their children's needs.	51% ¹ (SE of the mean = 1.0%) [1242 ² /2439 ³] x 100= 50.9%	54% ¹ (SE of the mean = 1.0%) [1453 ² /2703 ³] x 100= 53.8%	51% ¹ (SE of the mean = 0.9%) [1505 ² /2969 ³] x 100= 50.7%	53% ¹ (SE of the mean = 0.9%) [1580 ² /2981 ³] x 100= 53.0%	53% ¹ (SE of the mean = 0.9%) [1682 ² /3163 ³] x 100= 53.2%
4C: Help their children develop and learn.	73% ¹ (SE of the mean = 0.9%) [1778 ² /2439 ³] x 100= 72.9%	75% ¹ (SE of the mean = 0.8%) [2025 ² /2703 ³] x 100= 74.9%	72% ¹ (SE of the mean = 0.8%) [2147 ² /2969 ³] x 100= 72.3%	75% ¹ (SE of the mean = 0.8%) [2247 ² /2981 ³] x 100= 75.4%	77% ¹ (SE of the mean = 0.7%) [2440 ² /3163 ³] x 100= 77.1%

¹ Percentage of respondents at or above the Indicator 4 NCSEAM standard score (539 for Indicator 4A, 556 for Indicator 4B and 516 for Indicator 4C). Percent reported for indicators are rounded off.

² Number of respondents in the sample at or above the indicator standard score.

³ Number of respondents with a Rasch score.

Data source: Family Survey, Wayne State University, Center for Urban Studies

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2009:

This report summarizes the data collected by the State of Michigan *Early On*/Part C Qualitative Compliance Information Project (QCIP) for FFY 2009. It presents the findings from the *Early On* QCIP annual survey to the system's participants. This year's survey was distributed in March 2010. Out of 7,893 families who received the survey, a total of 3,209 families completed and returned the survey, which provided a response rate of 40.7%. Rasch analysis was used to generate an Impact on Family Scale (IFS) score for **3,163 respondents**; the remaining 46 respondents did not answer a sufficient number of scale items to generate a score. When possible, comparisons are made between the FFY 2009 survey results and those from previous years.

The findings in this report indicate that, overall, the *Early On* system is helping families, despite some challenges. Most respondents continue to report high levels of satisfaction with referrals, assessments, IFSPs, and service coordination.

Major findings from the survey include the following:

- No major changes in referral sources. There were no major shifts in sources of referrals. Hospitals and doctors/nurses accounted for over half of referrals (53.6%) this year. Referrals from the Department of Human Services (8.3% in 2010, and 5.5% in 2009), and other resources (9.9% in 2010, and 6.4% in 2009) increased from last year. Referrals from local schools decreased slightly (3.9% in 2010, and 5.0% in 2009).
- Parents continue to have positive experiences with the assessment process. The percentage of families reporting that their input was solicited during the assessment process increased 3% to 90.6%

from 2009 to 2010. The vast majority of respondents (95.3%) agreed that *Early On* staff asked them appropriate questions about the needs of their family and child, and that staff seem to know what they are talking about (94.7%). Families also reported that the assessment process was respectful of their family and culture (94.2%) and that the assessment was completed promptly (90.9%).

- *Recognition of initial IFSP meetings remains high, most IFSPs were completed within the 45-day timeline and percent of families who felt satisfaction with recent IFSP meetings was increasing.* In 2010, 90.4% of respondents indicated they had an IFSP meeting. This is similar with the last two years (90.0% in 2008 and 90.7% in 2009). The percentage of respondents who indicated that their IFSP meeting took place in 45 days or less is also similar to previous years (69.8% in 2008, 71.0% in 2009, and 69.8% in 2010). If families who answered “don’t know/don’t remember” were excluded from the analysis, the percentage increased to 91.0%, the same as last year. There was an increase in the percent of families reporting satisfaction with their most recent IFSP meeting (90.5% in 2010 versus 89.9% in 2009). Though decreased from last year (84.7% in 2009 and 83% in 2010), many families felt that their IFSP has been keeping up with their family’s changing needs. An increasing percent of families felt that when they mentioned something about their children’s special needs, it was taken into consideration (86.2% in 2010 versus 85.3% in 2009). A similar trend was seen in terms of their family’s needs (80.5% in 2010 versus 76.7% in 2009).
- *Decline in knowledge of rights in the IFSP process.* The percentage of families who reported they were fully informed of their rights when they agreed to the IFSP process dropped 3.5 percentage points from last year (79.1% in 2010, compared to 82.6% in 2009).
- *More frequent IFSP reviews.* There was a slight increase in IFSP reviews, with 49.4% of 2010 respondents reporting that their IFSP was updated every six months, as compared to 47.4% of 2009 and 45.4% in 2008. There was a slight decrease between 2009 and 2010 in the percentage of respondents who thought that their IFSP was keeping up with their family’s changing needs (83.0% in 2010 and 84.7% in 2009).
- *Slight decline on recognition of service coordinator.* There was a slight decrease in the percentage of respondents who recognized having a service coordinator compared to last year (72.2% in 2010 versus 74.4% in 2009). Respondents’ overall satisfaction with service coordination also decreased (85.3% in 2010 versus 89.8% in 2009).
- *Service providers continue to receive high ratings.* As in previous years, almost all of the respondents had positive experiences with their service providers. Over 90% of families reported that their service provider was dependable (94.3%), easy to talk to (96.3%), and was good at working with the family (96.0%). Families also felt that their providers supplied them with information and training so they could help their children (90.9% in 2010, 91.3% in 2009, 88.9% in 2008).
- *Increased reporting of receiving services in natural environments.* The proportion of respondents who indicated their child received services in the home or wherever their child spent most of his or her time had a two percentage point increase from 83.7% in 2009 to 85.4% in 2010. Slightly more families reported that their children received services in settings where children without special needs participate compared to last year’s (59.2% in 2010 versus 57.6% in 2009).

FFY 2009 Part C State Performance of Indicator 4 (Impact on Family)

SPP/APR Indicator 4A:	Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family: A. <i>Know their rights</i>
Percent at or above Indicator 4A standard: 58% (SE of the mean = 0.9%)	
SPP/APR Indicator 4B:	Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family: B. <i>Effectively communicate their children's needs.</i>
Percent at or above Indicator 4B standard: 53% (SE of the mean = 0.9%)	
SPP/APR Indicator 4C:	Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family: C. <i>Help their children develop and learn.</i>
Percent at or above Indicator 4C standard: 77% (SE of the mean = 0.7%)	
Number of Valid Responses: 3,163	Mean Measure: 612
Measurement reliability: 0.93	Measurement SD: 158

Source: Avatar International Report

Five items below represent areas to target for improvement (the numeral in parenthesis is the calibration for that item on the Impact Family scale, based on Rasch analysis):

- I was offered help I needed, such as child care services or transportation, to participate in the IFSP. (616)
- My family was given information about community programs that are open to all children. (623)
- My family was given information about how to advocate for my child and my family. (625)
- My family was given information about organizations that offer support for parents of children with disabilities. (636)
- My family was given information about opportunities for my child to play with other children. (641)

Representativeness/Non-Response Bias

The survey responses returned are representative of the entire Michigan Part C/Early On population based on child gender, age, and length of services received. It was not representative though, based on eligibility or on some racial/ethnic groups. The under-representation of minorities in the Family Survey has been a continuing issue since the surveys were first sent out in 1993. Many strategies have been utilized to increase the number of responses from minorities, including the availability of Spanish and Arabic interpreters, a toll-free number for English and non-English respondents, targeted follow-up mailing, and telephone interviews; further strategies will be examined for future improvement. Detailed descriptions are available through the data collection project at Wayne State University.

See Table 1 below for a summary of respondents' children's demographics, with comparisons to statewide demographics.

Table 1: FFY 2009 - Family Survey Respondents' Child Characteristics Compared to the State (2010)

	Family Survey Sample (Current Participants as of Dec. 1, 2009)	Statewide (Current Participants as of Dec 1, 2009)
<i>Gender</i>		
Male	63.6% (n=2,011)	62.8%
Female	36.4% (n=1,152)	37.2%
<i>Age at Participation</i>		
Birth to 1 year	51.6% (n=1,632)	52.5%
1 to 2 years	34.3% (n=1,084)	34.5%
2 to 3 years	14.1% (n=447)	13.0%
<i>Eligibility</i>		
Part C only	61.0% (n=1,931)	66.2%*
MI Special Education	39.0% (n=1,232)	33.8%*
<i>Race of Children</i>		
White	76.8% (n=2,430)	70.8%*
Black	14.3% (n=451)	18.7%*
Hispanic	5.3% (n=168)	6.4%*
Asian	1.7% (n=53)	1.8%
Native American	0.9% (n=27)	1.2%
Other/Multi-Racial	1.0% (n=34)	1.1%
<i>Length of Services</i>		
Less than a year	60.4% (n=1,909)	58.7%
One to two years	31.6% (n=999)	33.2%
Two to Three years	8.0% (n=255)	8.1%
Total	n=3,163	100%

* Difference between sample and statewide population is statistically significant. p<.05

Comparison of the eligibility of respondents' children with the state showed that the percentage of Michigan special education eligible children was higher than the statewide population (39.0%, vs. 33.8%, respectively). Also, in the Part C only children, the percentage of respondents' children (61.0%) was lower than the state percentage (66.2%).

Black children were under-represented in the sample (14.3% survey vs. 18.7% statewide) and so were Hispanic children (5.3% survey vs. 6.4% statewide). White children, on the other hand, were over-represented (76.8% survey vs. 70.8% statewide).

Description of Weighting Procedure to Adjust for Eligibility and Racial/Ethnic Representation

The distribution of eligibility and ethnicity in the survey population was not a perfect representation of the distribution found in the total Part C population. To determine if the difference made a significant impact on the findings related to Indicator 4, weights were applied to adjust the sample sizes for each ethnic and eligibility group.

Weights are commonly used to adjust survey results for under-and over-representation of specific subgroups in a sample population. Weighting provides an estimate of the results that would be found if the distribution of the ethnic and eligibility subgroups in the sample were identical to the distribution in the overall population. The result of weighting is the same as if you duplicated each Impact on Family score by as many times as the weight and then computed the average score.

Creation of Weights Based on Racial/Ethnic Distribution

Weights were calculated by dividing the proportion of each of the subgroups in the Part C population by the corresponding proportion in the sample¹. For example, in the Part C population the proportion of children identified as white was .708. In the survey sample, the proportion of white children was .768. Dividing .708 by .768 yields 0.92. Therefore, the weight assigned to white children was 0.92. The proportion of Black or African American children in the population was .187 but in the survey sample it was .143, making the weight 1.31. This computation was repeated for the remaining racial and ethnic groups: American Indian, Asian American, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, and Hispanic. The following table indicates the actual weights used in the analysis.

Table 2: Calculation of Weights

	Col A	Col B	Col C	Col D	Col B/Col D
	Population N*	Proportion of Population	Sample n**	Proportion of Sample	Weight
<i>Eligibility</i>					
Part C only	5,540	66.2%	1,931	61.0%	1.09
MI Special Education	2,825	33.8%	1,232	39.0%	0.87
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>					
White	5,922	70.8%	2,430	76.8%	0.92
Black	1,566	18.7%	451	14.3%	1.31
Hispanic	537	6.4%	168	5.3%	1.21

* Families currently involved in Part C as of December 1, 2009.

** Includes only respondents with scores on the Impact on Family measure.

The original results and results after weighting are presented in Table 3 below; there is virtually no difference in the scores after weighting. **It suggests that even if the sample is not representative in terms of race/ethnicity and eligibility, it does not measurably affect the Indicator 4 results.**

Table 3: Indicator 4 results before and after weighting

	Un-weighted		Weighted by eligibility		Weighted by ethnicity	
	n	%	n	%	N	%
SPP 4A	1,833	58.0%	1,839	57.9%	1,826	57.8%
SPP 4B	1,682	53.2%	1,689	53.2%	1,672	52.9%
SPP 4C	2,440	77.1%	2,450	77.1%	2,431	77.0%
	mean	standard deviation	mean	standard deviation	Mean	standard deviation
Overall Score	611.7	158.3	611.3	158.4	610.4	158.3

Progress/Slippage

Michigan made progress from FFY 2008 on Indicator 4c, but did not improve on Indicators 4a and 4b. Although some progress was made, targets were not met. The Parent Involvement Committee (PIC) expanded its membership to include a Part C-only parent, MDE staff, local Part C Coordinators and Wayne State University staff to comprehensively review the targets and improvement activities and then determine if Michigan’s targets are achievable and appropriate based on statewide activities or if they should be revised. This new workgroup, titled the Family Outcomes Committee, reviewed the Family Survey and discussed each question to determine if any improvements to the survey could be made that would increase the chance of reaching the State targets. Some improvements for next year will include statements in the survey’s ‘Commonly Asked Questions’ document and the cover letter to inform families that if a question does not apply to them, they should leave it blank.

¹ Children who were eligible for Transition were not included because they were not included in the calculation of Impact scores.

The Family Outcomes Committee also reviewed APR data from states that use the NCSEAM survey, the same 22 items on the Family Impact Scale, and the Rasch analysis. Other states’ targets and activities were examined during this process. The Committee also reviewed the process used to set targets for the Child Outcomes Indicator, and the increment of expected increase related to child outcomes.

The Committee recommended to the MICC to revise the Family Outcome targets, beginning in 2010. Targets for 2011 and 2012 were also set. The MICC accepted the targets proposed by the Family Outcomes Committee and MDE will include the revised targets in the APR and amend the SPP. The revised targets are listed in the “Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources” section of the APR.

The PIC will closely review improvement activities to ensure there are statewide efforts in place that will help local service areas reach the targets and show improvement in this area.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

The following activities were included in the FFY 2007 and 2008 APRs and in the SPP that was updated in February 2009. An update on the progress of each activity is included:

Improvement Activity	Timelines	Resources
<p>Activity: Collaborate with existing in-state family-focused projects to understand their purpose and outcomes, and maximize their impact on achieving Part C Family Outcomes.</p>	<p>Continuing for 2007-2012</p>	<p>Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) Part B/C Family Project Parent Leadership initiatives <i>Early On</i> Training and Technical Assistance (EOTTA) PIC</p>
<p>Discussion: The PIC of the MICC met with the Michigan Alliance for Families and Citizens Alliance to Uphold Special Education (PTI) in February and March 2007 to learn about ongoing activities to support Part C parents. Representatives from these two projects are members of the PIC and attend regular meetings and provide ongoing updates about their work.</p> <p>A chart was developed to help understand the purpose and outcomes of each existing project and which aspects of <i>Early On</i>’s Family Outcomes the project will help address.</p> <p>The Michigan Alliance for Families was awarded the PTI grant in 2009. Michigan’s public awareness contractor, <i>Early On</i> Training and Technical Assistance (EOTTA), also participates in PIC meetings and discusses opportunities for parent trainings and learning opportunities at their meetings.</p>		
<p>Activity: Request/review additional analysis of Family Survey data by demographic characteristics (geographical, Part C only vs. enrolled in both Part C and Michigan Special Education; race; age of child; service coordination model in use in local community, etc.), to illustrate any correlations between demographics and higher scores.</p>	<p>Ongoing as annual survey results are received</p>	<p>QCIP project Avatar International, Inc. PIC Interagency staff</p>
<p>Discussion: Wayne State University (WSU) shared an analysis of demographic data with the PIC in March 2007. The data did exhibit differences among service area peer groups as well as for children who are Part C only; however, additional years of data must be analyzed to develop more targeted improvement activities. The committee will continue to analyze data from the annual survey.</p>		
<p>Activity: Analyze what other states that report high impact of early intervention are doing regarding Family Outcomes, including how much of their state budget is committed to achieving each family outcome, and what it is purchasing.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>PTI and PTI Network Early Intervention Family Alliance RRCs NECTAC ECO Center PIC Interagency staff</p>

APR Template – Part C (4)

<p>Discussion: The analysis was completed but did not yield information that would be helpful to changing practice. MDE will gather information from other states that report high levels of success with Family Outcomes. MDE will also review results from other states that use the NCSEAM survey and the ECO Family Survey to look at differences and outcomes. This work is continuing through the PIC.</p>		
<p>Activity: Review research already gathered during Redesign activities on best practices regarding Family Outcomes.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>PIC Interagency staff</p>
<p>Discussion: This information was gathered and some themes emerged from Redesign, which include: parent-to-parent support and mentoring, and providing training to parents and professionals together. These strategies are being implemented by MDE's parent support contractor.</p>		
<p>Activity: Use results of additional analysis/data gathering/research review to guide development of a list of promising practices to consider implementing in upcoming years.</p>	<p>Completed Ongoing through June 2011</p>	<p>PIC Interagency staff Part C contractors</p>
<p>Discussion: Themes from the analysis centered on parent-to-parent support, communication about rights, program knowledge, community resources/involvement, and looking at parents as service coordinators as a way to create that type of communication. These tie into work being done to develop a document that defines early intervention services and connects personnel standards to the services being provided.</p> <p>In FFY 2009, an RFP was released to allow local early intervention programs to create a module that trains and hires parents as service coordinators/liaisons.</p> <p>In March 2010, the RFP was awarded to Washtenaw ISD, which will work closely with the Michigan Alliance for Families (parent support contractor) to develop a Family Navigator model that could be replicated across the state. The Family Navigator would serve as a service coordinator/liaison for families of children in the early intervention system. Numerous trainings will provide Family Navigators the knowledge needed to work with other parents, and will include <i>Early On</i> 101 training, procedural safeguards training, community involvement training, community resource identification and referral, family support and advocacy training. The model will be tested in Washtenaw County and presented at the <i>Early On</i> Conference in 2011. The Family Navigator model will be completed by June 30, 2011.</p>		
<p>Activity: Review and modify Part C budget and grants to reflect that parents are equal partners in achieving their children's outcomes.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Part C Administrative structure MICC PIC</p>
<p>Discussion: This activity was achieved through the CSPD RFP. A parent was one of the readers for the RFP. The RFP included provisions to invite parents to participate in the trainings offered around the state and be trained side-by-side with professionals. This was included in the final contract with the agency.</p>		
<p>Activity: Ensure that any projects involved in collecting Family Outcomes data for Part C are advised by and responsive to an advisory body of Part C parents.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Part C Administrative structure MICC PIC</p>
<p>Discussion: The development of a parent advisory committee was included in the RFP for the Family Outcomes data collection project. The PIC reviews materials surrounding this indicator for many of the Mandated Activities Projects.</p>		
<p>Activity: Add item(s) to Family Survey to gather family input on approximately how many hours/month they are involved in <i>Early On</i> activities that help to achieve the three Family Outcomes.</p>	<p>Completed 2007-2010</p>	<p>QCIP Project PIC</p>
<p>Discussion: Due to lack of funds to reimburse parents in September and October 2007, the PIC did not meet; therefore, they have not yet had an opportunity to discuss the possibility of adding these questions to the survey. The budget has been resolved and new MICC appointments have been made; therefore, the committee will begin to meet again in February 2008 and will address this activity throughout the year. The goal of the activity is to determine if there is correlation between the amount of services received and positive Family Outcomes.</p> <p>In FFY 2008, the PIC determined it would not add items to the survey due to its length.</p> <p>In FFY 2009, the PIC expanded its membership to include a Part C only parent, MDE staff, local Part C Coordinators and WSU staff for the purpose of reviewing the Family Outcome targets and activities. The newly formed workgroup is the Family Outcomes Committee. This workgroup reviewed the Family Survey, question by question, and gave advice to WSU about the items. With insightful advice from Part C Coordinators, the length of the survey will not be</p>		

APR Template – Part C (4)

changed in an effort to allow local ISDs to review longitudinal data for each question.		
Activity: Assess impact of implementation plan; develop and implement new activities as needed.	2008-2012 Ongoing	Interagency staff PIC
<p>Discussion: Due to lack of funds to reimburse parents in September and October 2007, the PIC did not meet; therefore, this activity did not occur. The budget has been resolved and new MICC appointments have been made; therefore, the committee began to meet again in February 2008. The PIC reviewed the implementation plans in October 2008 and March 2009, looking for data demonstrating the impact of early intervention services on families.</p> <p>In FFY 2008, the PIC recommended there be designated staff to see that activities are updated and evaluated on a regular basis. MDE has identified <i>Early On</i> personnel to oversee the implementation plan and review activities regularly.</p> <p>The Family Outcomes liaison continues to work with the committee and MDE to assure all issues are addressed. A Family Outcomes ladder was developed to serve as a visual for the committee to better understand the NCSEAM survey and Rasch analysis. The ladder also helps the committee see exactly where Michigan's data are for Indicators 4a, b, and c.</p>		
Activity: Develop and deliver a presentation to increase parent and provider understanding of the Family Survey results, particularly the NCSEAM results (how it works, what the data mean, etc.).	Ongoing through 2012	CSPD contractor Family Training contractor PTI contractor Family Survey Data Collection contractor
<p>Discussion: While State interagency staff and members of the PIC have a better understanding of the NCSEAM survey and how to interpret the results, there is a need to extend this information sharing and improve understanding for other State ICC members and to providers, families, and ICC members in local service areas.</p> <p>In FFY 2008, the Family Outcomes contractor will go to four locations across the state and one MICC meeting to explain, share, and discuss the Family Survey and its results; as well as the impact the results have on the early intervention system in Michigan.</p> <p>In FFY 2009, WSU joined the newly formed Family Outcomes Committee to help the parents and others understand the process used to gather data through the Family Survey. The Family Outcomes contractor presented at the Part C/<i>Early On</i> Annual Conference in October 2010 and at the November 2010 MICC meeting and shared and interpreted the most recent Family Survey data.</p>		
Activity: Analyze return rate by service area, as well as mean score and range of scores; send results to each local service area.	Ongoing through 2012	Family Survey Data Collection contractor
Discussion: Individual service areas are able to analyze their Family Outcomes results and identify areas for improvement.		
Activity: Review data with service areas and existing in-state, family-focused projects to plan improvement activities to help achieve Part C Family Outcomes.	Ongoing through 2012	NCRRC IT Kit materials Family Survey Data Collection contractor CSPD contractor Family Training contractor PTI contractor
<p>Discussion: Beyond expanding the understanding of the NCSEAM survey, there is a need to help local service areas and the family support projects understand how they can use the survey results and results of the analysis of "promising practices" to help identify their own improvement activities related to Family Outcomes.</p> <p>In October 2010, the Pre-Day session of the <i>Early On</i> conference was designed for Part C Coordinators, focusing on Family Outcomes. Information was shared about research related to supporting Family Outcomes, current State initiatives underway regarding Family Outcomes, and round table discussions occurred. Ideas generated from the session have been shared with the Family Outcomes Committee.</p>		
Activity: Develop a reference bulletin for improving Family Outcomes related to Family Survey results.	Spring 2009-2012	CSPD contractor Family Training contractor Interagency staff PIC Family Outcomes Committee

APR Template – Part C (4)

<p>Discussion: While Michigan has historically valued parent involvement and surveyed parents to determine their view of <i>Early On</i>, guidance on improving Family Outcomes has not been developed. This guidance will help service areas develop activities based on their local analysis of data to improve results for their families.</p>		
<p>After the Family Outcomes Committee completes its work, the reference bulletin will be developed.</p>		
<p>Activity: Determine means to create parent peer mentors or parent-to-parent models, especially related to service coordination and personnel standards.</p>	<p>Fall 2008-2012</p>	<p>Family Training contractor PTI contractor</p>
<p>Discussion: The PIC identified these strategies as the most likely to increase the impact of <i>Early On</i> services as they relate to Family Outcomes.</p> <p>In FFY 2009, an RFP was released to allow local early intervention programs to create a module that trains and hires parents as service coordinators/liaisons.</p> <p>In March 2010, the RFP was awarded to Washtenaw ISD, which will work closely with the Michigan Alliance for Families (parent support contractor) to develop a Family Navigator model that could be replicated across the state. The Family Navigator will serve as a service coordinator/liaison for families of children in the early intervention system. Numerous trainings will provide Family Navigators the knowledge needed to work with other parents, and will include <i>Early On</i> 101 training, procedural safeguards training, community involvement training, community resource identification and referral, family support and advocacy training. The model will be tested in Washtenaw County and presented at the <i>Early On</i> Conference in 2011. The Family Navigator model will be completed by June 30, 2011.</p>		
<p>Activity: Perform analysis demonstrating convergent validity of NCSEAM Family Survey results and other APR data as well as results from other sections of the Family Survey.</p>	<p>Ongoing through 2012</p>	<p>Family Survey Data Collection contractor PIC Family Outcomes Committee</p>
<p>Discussion: Michigan will learn more about its performance in meeting Family Outcomes from an analysis of the NCSEAM survey results with other APR data, and with data from other sections of the Family Survey. This analysis will also allow the State to develop more targeted improvement activities.</p> <p>MDE will review results from other states that use the NCSEAM survey and the ECO Family Survey to look at differences and outcomes.</p> <p>The Family Outcomes Committee compared data from Michigan and other states using the same survey, the same 22 items, and the Rasch analysis. As a result, the targets were revised, and ideas for new improvement activities were discussed. Improvement activities will be discussed and implemented over the next year.</p>		
<p>Activity: Evaluate means to increase response rate for subgroups responding to the Family Survey, as identified through analysis and results.</p>	<p>Ongoing through 2012</p>	<p>Family Survey Data Collection contractor</p>
<p>Discussion: Again this year, the Family Survey sample is not representative of the race of the children enrolled in <i>Early On</i>, or of the families living in urban areas. There is a need to evaluate and develop new means to attempt to address this discrepancy.</p> <p>The Family Survey contractor has multiple modes in which a family may complete the survey; examples include written, oral, and face to face.</p> <p>The survey responses returned are representative of the entire Michigan Part C/<i>Early On</i> population based on child gender, age, and length of services received. The responses were not representative, based on eligibility or on some racial/ethnic groups. The under-representation of minorities in the Family Survey has been a continuing issue since the surveys were first sent out in 1993. Many strategies have been utilized to increase the number of responses from minorities, including the availability of Spanish and Arabic interpreters, a toll-free number for English and non-English respondents, targeted follow-up mailing, and telephone interviews; further strategies will be examined for future improvement.</p> <p>To determine if the difference made a significant impact on the findings related to Indicator 4, weights were applied to adjust the sample size for each ethnic and eligibility group. A detailed description of the weighting process is listed on page 31 of this Indicator. There is virtually no difference in the scores after weighting. It suggests that even if the sample is not representative in terms of race/ethnicity and eligibility, it does not measurably affect Indicator 4 results.</p>		

APR Template – Part C (4)

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2010:

Improvement Activity	Timelines	Resources
Activity: The PTI grantee, Michigan Alliance for Families, will create and disseminate mini-folders to parents whose children are enrolled in Part C.	2010-2012	Michigan PTI grantee PIC MDE staff
<p>Discussion: Mini-folders will be developed around topics such as IFSP, Natural Environments, Family Rights, and Transition. These mini-folders will be shared with parents in small groups in informal gatherings, allowing time to answer questions and explain the materials. This activity replicates the support provided to Part B families.</p> <p>Drafts of the mini-folders were shared in June 2010 with the PIC and feedback was given. Revisions will be made and shared with the PIC when completed. The mini-folders will allow parent mentors to have a set of documents that guide a structured introductory conversation about Child and Family Outcomes, IFSPs, Natural Environments, Family Rights and/or Transition to use with families in <i>Early On</i>.</p>		
Activity: The <i>Early On</i> Guidebooks will be revised.	2009-2012	Public Awareness grantee State Interagency staff PIC Center for Education Networking
<p>Discussion: Due to the change in eligibility, the <i>Early On</i> Guidebooks will be updated and available in a variety of formats for families.</p> <p>The committee continues to meet and has reviewed Guidebooks from other states. A blog was created to share information, increase communication, and provide updates to <i>Early On</i> Coordinators about the progress of the redesign process. The redesigned guidebooks will use New Mexico's FIT (Family Infant Toddler) Program book as a model.</p>		
Activity: Public awareness activities will be developed to help families understand their rights.	2010-2012	Public Awareness grantee State Interagency staff PIC Center for Education Networking Michigan Alliance for Families <i>Early On</i> Coordinators
<p>Discussion: A variety of materials will be developed and shared with families to help them better understand their rights for Part C.</p>		
Activity: Develop a statewide, unified approach to supporting families.	2010-2012	MDE DHS DCH
<p>Discussion: Representatives from MDE, DCH and DHS will work on developing key objectives for each agency that serves young children and families. This plan will be shared with all involved and implemented.</p>		
Activity: Family Outcome targets were revised for 2010 and set for 2011 and 2012.	2010-2012	MDE Family Outcomes Committee MICC
<p>Discussion: The targets for 2010-2012 are as follows:</p> <p>FFY 2010 -- SPP4A: 58%, SPP4B: 53%, SPP4C: 77% FFY 2011 -- SPP4A: 58.2%, SPP4B: 53.2%, SPP4C: 77.2% FFY 2012 -- SPP4A: 58.4%, SPP4B: 53.4%, SPP4C: 77.4%</p>		
Activity: Release an RFP, titled <i>Climb to the Top</i> , to improve Family Outcomes on a statewide level.	2010-2012	MDE
<p>Discussion: The RFP is for State partnering agencies, ISDs, institutions of higher education, and eligible local partnerships to develop and share activities and strategies designed to improve Family Outcomes as stated in the SPP/APR, Indicator 4 for Part C. This grant will be awarded under Part C of the IDEA, American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds.</p>		

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See page 1 of this APR.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/Child Find

Indicator 5: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to one year with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to one year old with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to one)] times 100 compared to national data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	1.5%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009: 1.24%

The percent of children birth to one year of age served in Michigan for FFY 2009 was **1.24%**. The 57 local early intervention programs served a snapshot total of 1,538 children aged birth to one year on December 1, 2009 while the number of births in 2009 was 123,960.

Percent served, birth to one year							
	FFY 2003	FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006	FFY 2007	FFY 2008	FFY 2009
Michigan	1.0%	1.1%	1.03%	1.08%	1.08%	1.15%	1.24%
Hawaii	3.0%	2.8%	2.31%	6.98%	5.00%	4.48%	1.27%
Louisiana	1.3%	1.7%	1.79%	0.83%	1.27%	1.46%	1.56%
Ohio	0.9%	0.8%	1.33%	1.43%	1.67%	1.75%	1.75%
Vermont	1.0%	0.9%	1.10%	1.34%	1.36%	1.34%	1.12%
National	0.9%	0.9%	0.95%	1.04%	1.06%	1.04%	1.03%

Data sources: Michigan Part C 618 data system annual December collection; Michigan Birth Registry Data 2009; IDEA data charts

Related Data

Referral Source	FFY 2002	FFY 2003	FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006	FFY 2007	FFY 2008	FFY 2009
Education	74	56	74	76	72	82	104	143
Family	95	159	175	184	191	131	144	210
Health Dept.	227	240	222	221	201	104	98	181
Hospitals	517	543	597	532	568	391	329	406
Mental Health	16	13	13	7	7	4	12	12
Other	151	100	110	108	145	112	50	85
Physicians	30	66	73	109	75	76	71	94
Social Services	43	33	83	95	112	94	155	222
Unknown	145	208	139	87	104	474	437	185
Total	1,298	1,418	1,486	1,419	1,475	1,468	1,400	1,538

Data source: Michigan Part C 618 data system annual December collection

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2009:

The number of referrals from unknown sources decreased in 2009. When the Part C data collection system switched from EETRK to MI-CIS in 2007-08, some of the referral sources were lost in the conversion, resulting in a large number of unknown referral sources. This issue was resolved in the June 2009 count, now that the MI-CIS system is in place.

Progress/Slippage

Michigan improved its identification for infants age birth to one year from 1.15% to 1.24%, but still did not reach the target of 1.5%. Progress may be attributed to Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) referrals, public awareness campaigns, and outreach to Neonatal Intensive Care Units and physicians. After reviewing national data and many statewide factors MDE revised the target for Indicator 5 for 2010 and set new targets for 2011 and 2012. One consideration was the new eligibility definition for *Early On*. Previously, Michigan had a broad eligibility definition, which allowed a child with ‘any delay’ to be enrolled in *Early On*. As of July 1, 2010, the new eligibility definition was put into place.

Michigan’s new eligibility definition is:

Developmental delay is defined as follows:

Age	Percent Delay
Up to 2 months* old	Any delay
2-36* months old	20% delay in one or more areas of development (or a score of one standard deviation below the mean)

*adjust for prematurity through chronological age of 24 months

In addition, the new categories of Established Conditions are:

- Congenital Anomalies
- Chromosomal Anomalies
- Infectious Conditions
- Endocrine/Metabolic Disorders
- Other Diseases
- Hearing Deficiency
- Other Fetal/Placental Anomalies
- Exposures Affecting Fetus
- Chronic Illness
- Developmental Disorders
- Mental Health Conditions

Another factor expected to impact identification rates is the newly adopted funding formula for Part C. The new funding formula will be put into place for July 1, 2011. The new formula will continue to distribute 80% of the federal award to the field, based on the following factors:

- Base Block for Administration according to size
Range of Base Block:

Rural Communities	(20)	\$50,000
Small Sized Cities	(17)	\$65,000
Medium Sized Cities	(10)	\$80,000
Metro Communities	(5)	\$125,000
Urban Communities	(5)	\$150,000
- An increasing target percentage of births to be served based on the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) targets approved by OSEP.

APR Template – Part C (4)

Increasing Targets of Children to be Served (Birth to Three/Indicator 6)

FFY 2005	FFY 2006	FFY 2007	FFY 2008	FFY 2009	FFY 2010	FFY 2011
2.2%	2.3%	2.4%	2.5%	2.6%	2.7%	2.8%

MDE also looked at the national average, which is 1.03% served and decided to keep the target above the national average; yet it is more realistic for Michigan considering the economic stress the State is under and higher than average unemployment rates, which may impact family access to services and depress the rate of referral from service agencies.

The revised and new targets are located in the “Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2010” section.

Improvement Activities

The following activities were included in the FFY 2007 APR and in the SPP that was updated in February 2009. An update on the progress of each activity is included.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Activity: The <i>Early On</i> system will develop a joint policy for the MDE and DHS responding to CAPTA and IDEA legislation for referral of all children substantiated for abuse and neglect.	Completed	Ad Hoc subcommittee of the MICC
Discussion: The CAPTA Ad Hoc workgroup completed its work and made recommendations regarding CAPTA referrals during the reporting period. The recommendation was to refer all victims of children in category one or two cases based on a preponderance of evidence of abuse/neglect. The DHS initiated an automatic referral process with statewide rollout in January 2008. The DHS will review the data with regard to the number of referrals that are generated in FFY 2007 to determine if the automated referral has an impact on increasing the numbers of children found eligible for Part C. Additionally, the DHS has updated its policy with regard to CAPTA and <i>Early On</i> and the approved policy is planned to go into effect in January 2008. It will provide additional guidance to local DHS workers regarding the interactions between DHS and <i>Early On</i> . The CAPTA policy went into effect January 2008. DHS continues to train staff on the joint policy. In addition, an ad hoc committee met and discussed issues related to CAPTA referrals. Issues include lack of referrals, difficulty finding the child, and keeping the information updated. DHS will review all information before it is sent to the local districts. DHS is working with <i>Early On</i> Training and Technical Assistance, the CSPD contractor, to eliminate the issue of duplicate referrals entering the system.		
Activity: The <i>Early On</i> system will implement the new monitoring system, CIMS, with identification rate as a priority area.	Completed	Part C Coordinator CIMS contractor
Discussion: In FFY 2004, two service areas were identified as pilot sites for focused monitoring based on their identification rates. Both have shown improvement since that time. In FFY 2005, one service area was visited based on low performance with this indicator. That service area improved performance to meet the State target within one year. In FFY 2006, one additional service area was visited based on low performance with this indicator. That service area has submitted an improvement plan that has been approved by MDE. The service area has since made improvement. Also in FFY 2006, Michigan utilized data on performance indicators as well as compliance indicators in making determinations. Based on determinations made in June 2007, four service areas were selected as focused monitoring sites for FFY 2007. Three of the four were not meeting the State target of 1.1% in FFY 2005. They were required to submit improvement plans and quarterly reports demonstrating improvement through FFY 2008.		
Activity: Implement public awareness activities as identified through the <i>Early On</i> Redesign.	Completed	Public awareness contractor MICC
Discussion: The public awareness contractor completed the activities as identified in the work plan. These included advertisements on buses, billboards, and the radio in selected service areas and the provision of 18,000 <i>Early On</i> brochures for literacy kits shipped to every licensed child care provider in the state.		

APR Template – Part C (4)

<p>Activity: The Eligible Population Task Force will review the eligibility definition, conducting a prevalence study and reviewing Michigan's eligibility process.</p>	<p>Ongoing training through 2012</p>	<p>Eligible Population Task Force CSPD contractor</p>
<p>Discussion: The Eligible Population Task Force, formed as a part of Redesign, has reviewed and taken public comment regarding Michigan's Part C eligibility definition. The proposed definition sets eligibility for infants under two months adjusted age at any level of delay with re-determination within six months, and eligibility for children over two months adjusted age with a 20% delay in one or more areas of development. After the reporting period, the proposed changes to Michigan's Part C eligibility went out for public hearing in November 2007. After consideration of public comment, if Michigan decides to go forward with the change in eligibility, formal OSEP approval will be requested before implementation.</p> <p>Michigan submitted the new definition of eligibility to OSEP in May 2009 and it was accepted. Training and technical assistance to the local early intervention programs about the new eligibility definition began in 2009 and full implementation will be July 2010.</p> <p>During winter 2010, the CSPD contractor provided training on the new eligibility definition to 220 staff in ten ISDs around the state. An on-line version of the training is being developed and will be available October 2010.</p> <p>An on-line training titled Eligibility Tools: Calculating Delay was developed and shared and teaches the field how to calculate percentage/standard deviation of delay using each of the recommended eligibility tools. Since February 2010, 168 people have enrolled in this training.</p>		
<p>Activity: The Michigan Part C data system will be upgraded to ensure timely and accurate collection of utilization and outcome data for <i>Early On</i>.</p>	<p>Ongoing through 2012</p>	<p>Part C Administrative Structure Michigan Part C data system contractor</p>
<p>Discussion: Enhancements to the data collection system were made so that all data needed for the APR compliance indicators could be obtained through the State data system.</p> <p>The Michigan Part C data system was upgraded to include additional components necessary to collect accurate data for all compliance indicators.</p>		
<p>Activity: Develop Requests for Proposals for training and technical assistance, and child find and public awareness contracts.</p>	<p>Completed in 2007</p>	<p>Interagency staff</p>
<p>Activity: Award training and technical assistance, and child find and public awareness contracts.</p>	<p>Completed in 2007</p>	<p>MDE staff</p>
<p>Discussion: A new public awareness contract was awarded beginning October 2007. The contract combines public awareness and referral activities for both Part C and Part B of IDEA. This has allowed the contractor to better use resources to implement public awareness strategies and provide materials to local service areas at no cost to the local service areas. The contractor has created a web-based referral process in addition to accepting toll-free telephone and fax referrals.</p>		
<p>Activity: Analyze data measuring this indicator and develop additional improvement activities.</p>	<p>Ongoing with annual review through 2012</p>	<p>Interagency staff Part C contractors MICC Stakeholders</p>
<p>Discussion: As evidenced in the APR, analysis of data from multiple sources related to the SPP indicators has led to the development of additional, more targeted improvement activities.</p>		
<p>Activity: Analyze effect of the electronic CAPTA referral system.</p>	<p>Winter 2008 Ongoing</p>	<p>Public awareness contractor DHS staff</p>
<p>Discussion: Preliminary analysis indicates a need to drill down and identify system barriers and reasons for an increase in referrals not leading to eligibility.</p>		
<p>Activity: Implement additional public awareness strategies as developed by the public awareness and referral information contractor.</p>	<p>Fall 2007 Ongoing</p>	<p>Public awareness contractor MDE grant manager</p>

Discussion: The Public Awareness and Referral contractor launched a media campaign which included 293 radio Public Service Announcement commercials, statewide, from September 2007-October 2007. Also purchased were 28 30-second spots on Public Radio highlighting information about the Part C system, during the same timeframe, in English and Spanish.

Also from September 2007-October 2007, a billboard campaign occurred which targeted metropolitan areas, with an emphasis on the birth to one year old population.

The two campaigns were implemented simultaneously to have the greatest impact, reaching out visually, through the billboards, and auditorally through the radio.

An additional market was tapped, which included print advertising, also with an emphasis on the birth to one year old population. Advertisements were purchased in *Metro Baby* magazine which targeted large metropolitan service areas in May 2008 and November 2008. A similar advertisement was purchased in *Grand Rapids Family* magazine in June 2008 and November 2008.

The statewide *Early On* display board is taken and displayed at many different conferences around the state throughout the year.

During FFY 2009 the following strategies will be implemented:

- Provide oversight and organization to revise/condense existing *Early On* Guidebooks to streamline information and incorporate information regarding the Child and Family Outcomes.
- Update the Child Developmental Wheel and the “*Baby Steps*” poster to align with the new design/layout and look of the *Early On* Guidebooks.
- Develop an e-store and offer promotional products/materials for local *Early On* systems to purchase.
- Conduct Phase 1 of the conversion of the *Early On* Central Directory to an online searchable database.
- Implement Social Networking initiatives including the creation of a Twitter account to provide other systems and coordinators with up-to-date information about *Early On*/Child Find, the creation of a Facebook page to increase awareness, networking, and information sharing amongst stakeholders.
- Create an e-survey (using Zoomerang) to evaluate customer service to those calling 1-800-Early On, in collaboration with Wayne State University; replaces the post-card evaluation modality.
- Place *Early On* advertisements in the *Metro Parent* and *Metro Baby* publications. Each will have an e-book link provided on the www.1800EarlyOn.org website. Distribution of publication expected: fall 2009 and/or spring 2010.

The following activities occurred during FFY 2009:

- Collaboration continued with the Family-to-Family Health and Information Workgroup/Public Awareness to strengthen outreach among partners, parents, and children with special needs and/or supports.
- Printed advertisements were placed in *Metro Baby* magazine, a parent publication of *Metro Parent*, targeted for parents of children birth to one year. Outreach was concentrated in Livingston, Oakland, Macomb, Washtenaw, and Wayne counties.
- An e-book was placed on websites for parents to search for local resources.
- Updated the 2008-2009 *Early On* Michigan Central Directory for Infants and Toddlers.
- The “So Big” booklet (English) and “Tan Grande” booklet translated into Spanish were new this year and distributed.
- The *Early On*/Project Find bookmark was translated into Spanish and printed.
- A Twitter page branded as <http://www.twitter.com/ChildFindMich> was launched in July 2009 to build awareness about early intervention support and special education services.
- The *Early On* Guidebooks will be revised and available in a variety of formats for families. A committee, consisting of members from the Public Awareness grantee, State Interagency staff, the Parent Involvement Committee, the Center for Education Networking, the Michigan Alliance for Families, and *Early On* Coordinators has met several times throughout the year and has reviewed guidebooks from other states. A blog was created to share information, increase communication, and provide updates to *Early On* Coordinators about the progress of the redesign process. The redesigned guidebooks will use New Mexico’s FIT (Family Infant Toddler) Program book as a model.
- The statewide *Early On* display board was taken and displayed at many different conferences around the state throughout the year.

APR Template – Part C (4)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The "Don't Worry But Don't Wait" presentation was shared at numerous events and conferences around the state. In January 2010, the <i>Early On</i> Michigan Facebook page was launched to increase awareness and build an online early childhood community. The e-store will be up and running in the fall of 2010. The Zoomerang survey was used for an initial round, but will not be used as a platform for this upcoming year because it didn't meet our needs. 		
Activity: Limit the amount of Part C funds used by each local service area for public awareness activities.	Completed Summer 2008	Interagency staff Public awareness contractor
Discussion: The Public Awareness and Referral contractor prints numerous products that local service areas may order, free of charge, such as the <i>Early On</i> Guidebooks, brochures, and child development wheels. New products available include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Early On</i> Project Find web cards which highlight the <i>Early On</i> website. These are also shared at conferences around the state, when the display board is used. <i>Early On</i> Project Find referral magnets for both professionals and parents. Growth charts, containing similar information as the child development wheel but in a chart format, so parents can chart the growth of their child up to five years of age. <p>Watch Me Grow calendars, created in partnership with the Michigan State University Extension, are given to local service areas to share with parents.</p>		
Activity: Continue to work with the Michigan Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) on Assuring Better Child Health and Development (ABCD) grant to improve universal developmental screening at well child visits.	Completed grant Ongoing outreach through 2012	DCH – Medicaid Michigan Chapter (AAP)
Discussion: The ABCD Project promotes the use of an objective developmental screening tool as part of well-child care. The target population is infants and toddlers, age birth to three who are eligible for Medicaid. A pilot study was completed in nine pediatric practices and data from the first six months look promising for identifying children who are eligible for early intervention services. <p>Continue collaboration with the ABCD initiative through the provision of resources and supports.</p> <p>In collaboration with the ABCD Project, a workgroup was developed and has met several times throughout 2009 with the Michigan Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics and the Michigan Department of Community Health to streamline the referral process for primary care providers.</p>		

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2010:

Activity: The percent of infants and toddlers served, age birth to one, targets were revised for 2010 and set for 2011 and 2012.	2010-2012	MDE MICC						
Discussion: <table> <tr> <td>FFY 2010</td> <td>Target- 1.24%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FFY 2011</td> <td>Target- 1.24%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FFY 2012</td> <td>Target- 1.24%</td> </tr> </table>			FFY 2010	Target- 1.24%	FFY 2011	Target- 1.24%	FFY 2012	Target- 1.24%
FFY 2010	Target- 1.24%							
FFY 2011	Target- 1.24%							
FFY 2012	Target- 1.24%							

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See page 1 of this APR.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/Child Find

Indicator 6: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to three years with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to one)] times 100 compared to national data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	2.6%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009: 2.86%

The percent of children birth to three years of age served in Michigan for FFY 2009 was **2.88%**. The 57 service areas served a snapshot total of 10,663 children aged birth to three years old on December 1, 2009 while the total number of births for 2007-2009 was 370,025.

Percent served, birth to three years							
	FFY 2003	FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006	FFY 2007	FFY 2008	FFY 2009
Michigan	2.1%	2.2%	2.2%	2.30%	2.44%	2.67%	2.88%
Hawaii	4.4%	4.3%	4.31%	7.48%	6.94%	6.74%	3.78%
Louisiana	1.8%	2.3%	1.76%	1.27%	1.78%	2.04%	2.27%
Ohio	1.9%	1.8%	2.47%	2.64%	2.98%	3.29%	3.21%
Vermont	3.3%	3.2%	3.20%	3.45%	4.00%	3.89%	3.93%
National	2.18%	2.2%	2.34%	2.43%	2.52%	2.66%	2.67%

Data sources: Michigan Part C 618 data system, annual December collection; Michigan Birth Registry 2009; IDEA Data Charts

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2009:

Progress/Slippage

Michigan continued to increase the percent of children birth to three years of age served in FFY 2009, exceeding the State target of 2.6%. The number of children served also increased from 10,023 to 10,663.

Michigan improved its identification for infants and toddlers age birth to three years. Progress may be attributed to Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) referrals, public awareness campaigns, and outreach to Neonatal Intensive Care Units and physicians.

APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan sent a new eligibility definition to OSEP in May 2009, and it was approved. Michigan's new eligibility definition, effective July 1, 2010 is:

Developmental delay is defined as follows:

Age	Percent Delay
Up to 2 months* old	Any delay
2-36* months old	20% delay in one or more areas of development (or a score of one standard deviation below the mean)

*adjust for prematurity through chronological age of 24 months

In addition, the new categories of Established Conditions are:

- Congenital Anomalies
- Chromosomal Anomalies
- Infectious Conditions
- Endocrine/Metabolic Disorders
- Other Diseases
- Hearing Deficiency
- Other Fetal/Placental Anomalies
- Exposures Affecting Fetus
- Chronic Illness
- Developmental Disorders
- Mental Health Conditions

Related Data

Referral Source	FFY 2002	FFY 2003	FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006	FFY 2007	FFY 2008	FFY 2009
Education	1,187	1,234	1,312	1,301	1,281	883	1,098	2,258
Family	2,089	3,134	3,390	3,740	4,047	2,043	3,004	4,500
Health Dept	1,983	1,976	1,966	1,954	2,074	898	760	1,346
Hospital	2,771	2,680	2,986	3,030	3,045	1,807	1,873	2,211
Mental Health	171	154	161	126	105	47	70	448
Other	2,121	1,556	1,600	1,527	1,614	1,766	731	1,286
Physician	643	1,073	1,514	1,948	2,209	1,099	1,924	2,589
Social Services	538	426	561	752	896	512	820	1,412
Unknown	2,042	2,349	1,997	1,481	1,460	8,709	8,382	3,866
Total	13,545	14,582	15,487	15,859	16,731	17,764	18,662	19,916

Data source: Michigan Part C 618 data system, annual December collection

Improvement Activities

The following activities were included in the FFY 2007 APR and in the SPP that was updated in February 2009. An update on the progress of each activity is included.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Activity: The <i>Early On</i> system will develop a joint policy for the MDE and DHS responding to CAPTA and IDEA legislation for referral of all children substantiated for abuse and neglect.	Completed	Ad Hoc subcommittee of the MICC
Discussion: The CAPTA Ad Hoc workgroup completed its work and made recommendations regarding CAPTA referrals during the reporting period. The recommendation was to refer all victims of children in category one or two cases based on a preponderance of evidence of abuse/neglect. The DHS initiated an automatic referral process with statewide rollout in January 2008, after the end of the reporting period. The DHS will review the data with regard to the number of referrals that are generated in FFY 2007 to determine if the automated referral has an impact on		

APR Template – Part C (4)

<p>increasing the number of children found eligible for Part C. Further analysis is needed to determine reasons why many of the referrals do not lead to eligibility.</p> <p>Additionally, the DHS has updated its policy with regard to CAPTA and <i>Early On</i> and the approved policy went into effect January 2008. It is to provide additional guidance to local DHS workers regarding the interactions between DHS and <i>Early On</i>.</p> <p>The DHS continues to train staff on the joint policy. In addition, an ad hoc committee met and discussed issues related to CAPTA referrals. Issues include lack of referrals, difficulty finding the child, and keeping the information updated. DHS will review all information before it is sent to the local districts. DHS is working with <i>Early On</i> Training and Technical Assistance, the CSPD contractor, to eliminate the issue of duplicate referrals entering the system.</p>		
<p>Activity: The <i>Early On</i> system will implement the new monitoring system, CIMS, with identification rate as a priority area.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Part C Coordinator CIMS contractor</p>
<p>Discussion: In FFY 2004, two service areas were identified as pilot sites for focused monitoring based on their identification rates. Both have shown improvement since that time. In FFY 2005, one service area was visited based on low performance with this indicator. That service area improved performance to meet the State target within one year. In FFY 2006, one additional service area was visited based on low performance with this indicator. That service area has submitted an improvement plan that has been approved by MDE. The service area has since made improvement. Also in FFY 2006, Michigan utilized data on performance indicators as well as compliance indicators in making determinations. Based on determinations made in June 2007, four service areas were selected as focused monitoring sites for FFY 2007. Three of the four were not meeting the State target of 2.2% in FFY 2005. They were required to submit improvement plans and quarterly reports demonstrating improvement through FFY 2008.</p>		
<p>Activity: Implement public awareness activities as identified through the <i>Early On</i> Redesign.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Public awareness contractor MICC</p>
<p>Discussion: The public awareness contractor completed the activities as identified in the work plan. These included advertisements on buses, billboards, and the radio in selected service areas and the provision of 18,000 <i>Early On</i> brochures for literacy kits shipped to every licensed child care provider in the state.</p>		
<p>Activity: The Eligible Population Task Force will review the eligibility definition, conducting a prevalence study and reviewing Michigan's eligibility process.</p>	<p>Completed</p> <p>Ongoing training through 2010</p>	<p>Eligible Population Task Force CSPD contractor</p>
<p>Discussion: The Eligible Population Task Force, formed as a part of Redesign, has reviewed and taken public comment regarding Michigan's Part C eligibility definition. The proposed definition sets eligibility for infants under two months adjusted age at any level of delay with re-determination within six months, and eligibility for children over two months adjusted age with a 20% delay in one or more areas of development. After the reporting period, the proposed changes to Michigan's Part C eligibility went out for public hearing in November 2007. After consideration of public comment, if Michigan decides to go forward with the change in eligibility, formal OSEP approval will be requested before implementation.</p> <p>Michigan submitted the new definition of eligibility to OSEP in May 2009, and it was accepted. Training and technical assistance to the local early intervention programs about the new eligibility definition began in 2009 and full implementation will be July 2010.</p> <p>During the winter of 2010, the CSPD contractor provided training on the new eligibility definition to 220 staff in ten ISDs around the state. An on-line version of the training was developed and made available during the winter of 2010.</p> <p>An on-line training titled Eligibility Tools: Calculating Delay was developed and shared and teaches the field how to calculate percentage/standard deviation of delay using each of the recommended eligibility tools. Since February 2010, 168 people have enrolled in this training.</p>		
<p>Activity: The Michigan Part C data system will be upgraded to ensure timely and accurate collection of utilization and outcome data for <i>Early On</i>.</p>	<p>2006-2010</p> <p>Completed</p>	<p>Part C Administrative Structure Michigan Part C data system contractor</p>
<p>Discussion: Enhancements to the data collection system were made so that all data needed for the APR could be obtained through the State data system.</p> <p>The Michigan Part C data system was upgraded to include additional components necessary to collect accurate data for all compliance indicators.</p>		

APR Template – Part C (4)

Activity: Develop Requests for Proposals for training and technical assistance and child find and public awareness contracts.	Completed May 2007	Interagency staff
Activity: Award training and technical assistance, and child find and public awareness contracts.	Completed October 2007	MDE staff
Discussion: A new public awareness contract was awarded beginning October 2007. The contract combines public awareness and referral activities for both Part C and Part B of IDEA. This has allowed the contractor to better use resources to implement public awareness strategies and to provide materials to local service areas, many at no cost. The contractor has created a web-based referral process in addition to accepting toll-free telephone and fax referrals.		
Activity: Analyze data measuring this indicator and develop additional improvement activities.	Ongoing with annual review through 2012	Interagency staff Part C contractors MICC Stakeholders
Discussion: As evidenced in the APR, analysis of data from multiple sources related to the SPP indicators has led to the development of additional, more targeted, improvement activities.		
Activity: Analyze effect of the electronic CAPTA referral system.	Winter 2008-2012	Public awareness contractor DHS staff
Discussion: Preliminary analysis indicates a need to drill down and identify system barriers and reasons for an increase in referrals not leading to eligibility.		
Activity: Implement additional public awareness strategies as developed by the public awareness and referral information contractor.	Fall 2007-2012 Ongoing	Public awareness contractor MDE grant manager
<p>Discussion: The Public Awareness and Referral contractor launched a media campaign which included 293 radio Public Service Announcement commercials, statewide, from September 2007-October 2007. Also purchased were 28 30-second spots on Public Radio highlighting information about the Part C system, during the same timeframe, in English and Spanish.</p> <p>Also from September 2007-October 2007 a billboard campaign occurred which targeted metropolitan areas, with an emphasis on the birth to one year old population.</p> <p>The two campaigns were implemented simultaneously to have the greatest impact, reaching out visually, through the billboards, and auditorally through the radio.</p> <p>An additional market was tapped, which included print advertising, also with an emphasis on the birth to one year old population. Advertisements were purchased in <i>Metro Baby</i> magazine which targeted large metropolitan service areas in May 2008 and November 2008. A similar advertisement was purchased in the <i>Grand Rapids Family</i> magazine in June 2008 and November 2008.</p> <p>The statewide <i>Early On</i> display board was taken and displayed at many different conferences around the state throughout the year.</p> <p>During the FFY 2009, the following strategies will be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide oversight and organization to revise/condense existing <i>Early On</i> Guidebooks to streamline information and incorporate information regarding the Child and Family Outcomes. • Update the Child Developmental Wheel and the "<i>Baby Steps</i>" poster to align with the new design/layout and look of the <i>Early On</i> Guidebooks. • Develop an e-store and offer promotional products/materials for local <i>Early On</i> programs to purchase. • Conduct Phase 1 of the conversion of the <i>Early On</i> Central Directory to an online searchable database. • Implement Social Networking initiatives including the creation of a Twitter account to provide other systems and coordinators with up-to-date information about <i>Early On</i>/Child Find, the creation of a Facebook page to increase awareness, networking, and information sharing amongst stakeholders. • Create an e-survey (using Zoomerang) to evaluate customer service to those calling 1-800-Early On, in collaboration with Wayne State University; replaces the post-card evaluation modality. • Place <i>Early On</i> advertisements in the <i>Metro Parent</i> and <i>Metro Baby</i> publications. Each will have an e-book link provided on the www.1800EarlyOn.org website. Distribution of publication expected: fall 2009 and/or spring 2010. 		

<p>The following activities occurred during FFY 2009:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration continued with the Family-to-Family Health and Information Workgroup/Public Awareness to strengthen outreach amongst partners, parents, and children with special needs and/or supports. • Printed advertisements were placed in the <i>Special Edition</i>, a parent publication of <i>Metro Parent</i> magazine, to target parents of children birth to three years and strengthen outreach to parents in Livingston, Wayne, Oakland, Macomb, and Washtenaw counties. • An e-book was placed on websites for parents to search for local resources. • Updated the 2008-2009 <i>Early On</i> Michigan Central Directory for Infants and Toddlers. • The “So Big” Booklet (English) and “Tan Grande” Booklet Translated into Spanish were new this year and distributed. • The <i>Early On</i>/Project Find Bookmark was translated into Spanish and printed. • A Twitter page branded as http://www.twitter.com/ChildFindMich was launched in July 2009 to build awareness about early intervention support and special education services. • The <i>Early On</i> Guidebooks will be revised and available in a variety of formats for families. A committee, consisting of members from the Public Awareness grantee, State Interagency staff, the Parent Involvement Committee, the Center for Education Networking, the Michigan Alliance for Families, and <i>Early On</i> Coordinators has met several times throughout the year and has reviewed Guidebooks from other states. A blog was created to share information, increase communication, and provide updates to <i>Early On</i> Coordinators about the progress of the redesign process. The redesigned guidebooks will use New Mexico’s FIT (Family Infant Toddler) Program book as a model. • The statewide <i>Early On</i> display board was taken and displayed at many different conferences around the state throughout the year. • The “Don’t Worry But Don’t Wait” presentation was shared at numerous events and conferences around the state. • In January 2010, the <i>Early On</i> Michigan Facebook page was launched to increase awareness and build an online early childhood community. • The e-store will be up and running in the fall of 2010. • The Zoomerang survey was used for an initial round, but will not be used as a platform for this upcoming year because it didn’t meet our needs. 		
<p>Activity: Limit the amount of Part C funds used by each local service area for public awareness activities.</p>	<p>Summer 2008</p>	<p>Interagency staff Public awareness contractor</p>
<p>Discussion: The Public Awareness and Referral contractor prints numerous products that local service areas may order, free of charge, such as the <i>Early On</i> Guidebooks, brochures, and child development wheels. New products that are available include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Early On</i> Project Find web cards which highlight the <i>Early On</i> website. These are also shared at conferences around the state, when the display board is used. • <i>Early On</i> Project Find referral magnets for both professionals and parents. • Growth charts, containing similar information as the child development wheel but in a chart format, so parents can chart the growth of their child up to five years of age. <p>Watch me Grow calendars, created in partnership with the Michigan State University Extension, are given to local service areas to share with parents.</p>		
<p>Activity: Continue to work with the Michigan Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) on Assuring Better Child Health and Development (ABCD) grant to improve universal developmental screening at well child visits.</p>	<p>Completed grant Ongoing outreach</p>	<p>DCH – Medicaid Michigan Chapter of AAP</p>
<p>Discussion: The ABCD Project promotes the use of an objective developmental screening tool as part of well child care. The target population is infants and toddlers, age birth to three years who are eligible for Medicaid. A pilot study was completed in nine pediatric practices and data from the first six months look promising for identifying children who are eligible for early intervention services.</p> <p>Continue collaboration with the ABCD initiative through the provision of resources and supports.</p> <p>In collaboration with the ABCD Project, a workgroup was developed and has met several times throughout 2009 with the Michigan Chapter of AAP and the DCH to streamline the referral process for primary care providers.</p>		

APR Template – Part C (4)

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2010:

Activity: The percent of infants and toddlers served, age birth to three, targets were set for 2011 and 2012.	2010-2012	MDE MICC
Discussion: FFY 2011 Target- 2.7% FFY 2012 Target- 2.7%		

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See page 1 of this APR.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/Child Find

Indicator 7: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and 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)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs 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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009:

99.50%

Data were collected in MEGS through a local self-assessment. Local early intervention programs selected a random representative sample of children. Local early intervention programs were required to sample 10% of their snapshot number or a minimum of ten records, whichever is greater. The records were a representative sample chosen from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010.

Infants Evaluated and Assessed and provided an Initial IFSP meeting Within Part C’s 45-day timeline:

a. Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline	597
b. Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	600
Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline (Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100)	99.50%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

All children referred to *Early On* are required to receive a comprehensive evaluation for eligibility and assessment of development and an initial IFSP meeting within 45 calendar days of referral. For this data collection activity, each local early intervention program was instructed to select a representative sample of 10%, or no less than ten children for small local early intervention programs, based on gender, ethnicity, eligibility (Part C or Part C and Michigan Special Education), and age. The data from the record review of the files from that sample were analyzed to compute the target data for FFY 2009. There were **99.50%** (597 of 600 of which there were 18 exceptional family circumstances) of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs who were first enrolled between July 1, 2009 and June 30, 2010 and had an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting within Part C's 45-day timeline.

The increase in performance rate in FFY 2009 as compared to FFY 2008 (99.40%) may be attributed to a number of factors. Michigan's CSPD grantee held several trainings to ensure that local early intervention programs understood the requirements of Indicator 7, in particular, how to document exceptional family circumstances.

During FFY 2009, Michigan continued updating the Michigan Part C data system to include the collection of data regarding providing services in a timely manner; details of Michigan's progress with the upgrades are provided in the discussion of the planned improvement activities in this indicator. In order to collect data for this indicator, the whole state submitted data in a local self-assessment using MEGS.

Michigan did not meet the target of 100% compliance with this indicator. Through self assessment, details on exceptional family circumstances were recorded and included in the FFY 2009 calculation. Of the 21 children who did not receive the 45-day timeline activities within the required 45 days, 18 had exceptional family circumstances documented in the file. They included requests from parents to wait on services, hospitalization of children, and parents not home. The three children who did not have the 45-day timeline activities initiated and did not have an exceptional family circumstance received all activities required for the 45-day timeline. As part of the local self-assessment in MEGS, early intervention programs were asked to document the cause for the delay. Staff unavailable or sick was the reason in all instances for a delay in the 45-day timeline. In addition, as part of the local self-assessment in MEGS, early intervention programs had to indicate whether the child received the 45-day timeline activities; in all cases, the child did receive the activities for the 45-day timeline.

One local early intervention program was issued a finding in FFY 2009 and had to submit, for approval, a corrective action plan in the CIMS-2 system that detailed strategies that the local early intervention program was to take to correct noncompliance, as soon as possible, but no later than one year from notification of the finding, including verification by the State. As part of the corrective action planning process, progress reports were submitted. Local early intervention programs are provided assistance by local regional monitors to develop corrective action plans and correct individual and systemic noncompliance. Progress reports required the local early intervention program to conduct file reviews. When progress reports indicated compliance or that a State target had been met, MDE required the early intervention program to submit files to the Lead Agency for verification of correction of noncompliance. A sample of records was sent to MDE and MDE used a checklist to verify correction of noncompliance.

MDE requested that the local early intervention program identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever was greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the federal and state standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

child and/or family. Verification involves review of a sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1).

Local early intervention programs are notified of the outcome of verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter. The collection of exceptional family circumstances helps compliance with this indicator. Another reason for the progress in this indicator is the training and technical assistance provided by the State and the training entity.

In order to maintain compliance, MDE will continue providing technical assistance through online trainings through MDE's CSPD grantee. In addition, MDE will monitor data to assure that local early intervention programs that are found to be in noncompliance write and implement corrective action plans.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2008 for this indicator: 99.40%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2008 (the period from July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009)	0
2. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	0
3. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

4. Number of FFY 2008 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	0
6. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

In FFY 2008, the State did not meet its target of 100%. No new findings were issued for Indicator 7 in FFY 2008. The actual target data in FFY 2009 of 99.50% is a result of continued FFY 2007 noncompliance. As reported in the FFY 2008 APR, all instances of noncompliance have been corrected.

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

All local early intervention programs that received findings were required to submit corrective action plans using the CIMS-2 system. In addition, progress reporting was required for those local early intervention programs where verification of correction of noncompliance had not been submitted to MDE. When data from progress reports indicated correction of noncompliance had been met, MDE required early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency for verification of correction of noncompliance. The Lead Agency uses a checklist, based on federal requirements, to verify correction of noncompliance.

MDE requested that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever was greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the federal and state standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan
State

provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. Verification involves review of a sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.321 (e)(2), 303.322 (e)(1), and 303.342(a).

Local early intervention programs are notified of the verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter closing the corrective action plan. In addition, the finding is closed out in the CIMS-2 system. For those local early intervention programs that did not meet their interim targets and compliance, sanctions will be enforced which may include being focused monitored, a compliance agreement, or intensive State supervision. Additional assistance to local programs was provided by local regional monitoring staff on how to correct for individual noncompliance and how to develop practices to assure ongoing compliance.

Verification of Correction of FFY 2008 noncompliance or FFY 2008 findings (either timely or subsequent):

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 7.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008:

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 7.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):

All local early intervention programs that were issued findings in FFY 2007 have corrected noncompliance. Reporting on all local early intervention programs issued findings for Indicator 7, were reported as corrected in the FFY 2008 APR.

Verification of Remaining FFY 2007 findings:

All local early intervention programs issued findings in FFY 2007 for Indicator 7 have been corrected and reported as corrected in the FFY 2008 APR.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007:

All findings of noncompliance were corrected and evidence was provided in the FFY 2008 APR.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2006 or Earlier (if applicable):

All findings of noncompliance have been verified and correction has taken place. All findings from FFY 2006 or earlier have been reported as corrected in the FFY 2008 APR.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the 45-day timeline requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a).	Michigan has verified correction of noncompliance for all local early intervention programs that were issued findings in FFY 2007. No findings were issued in FFY 2008, all noncompliance was continued noncompliance. The State reported the

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan
State

<p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p>	<p>correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2008 APR.</p>
<p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, for any child for whom the 45-day timeline was not met, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify correction.</p>	<p>MDE requested that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever was greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the federal and state standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. Verification involves review of a sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1).</p> <p>Local early intervention programs are notified of the outcome of verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter. The collection of exceptional family circumstances helps compliance with this indicator. Another reason for the progress in this indicator is the training and technical assistance provided by the State and the training entity.</p> <p>When conducting on-site monitoring, the State issues child Level Corrective Action Plans for all instances where the child has not received his/her 45-day timeline activities. The local early intervention program has 60 days to implement the activity/activities and send to the State evidence that the activity/activities took place. In addition, in the MEGS local self-assessment, the State asks that for any child where the 45-day timeline was not met, did the child receive the required activity/activities. In all instances, the children received their required 45-day timeline activities.</p>
<p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>	<p>The State has reviewed the improvement activities for this indicator.</p>

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred in FFY 2009:

The following activities were included in the FFY 2008 APR and in the SPP that was updated in February 2009. An update on the progress of each activity is included.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
<p>Activity: Through <i>Early On</i> Redesign, the system will examine whether to change the Michigan requirement of completing the initial IFSP within 45 days of referral. If the system decides to adopt OSEP's requirement (initial IFSP meeting within 45 days), the field will be made aware of the changes and the implications.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p><i>Early On</i> Redesign Leadership Team MICC</p>
<p>Discussion: The <i>Timely Services Reference Bulletin</i> was updated in the spring of 2007 and again in the fall of 2007 to include the corrected definition of the initial IFSP meeting as advised by OSEP. Michigan moved to the OSEP requirement for an initial meeting within 45 days of referral with an additional State requirement that the IFSP be completed within 60 days of referral.</p>		
<p>Activity: The <i>Timely Services Reference Bulletin</i> will be updated to include guidance on documenting and reporting exceptional family circumstances. It will be re-distributed to the field.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Interagency staff</p>
<p>Discussion: The <i>Timely Services Reference Bulletin</i> also included guidance to the field on documenting exceptional family circumstances. It was shared with the field in draft format in the fall of 2006. The final version of the reference bulletin was distributed in 2008.</p>		
<p>Activity: The Michigan Part C data system will be upgraded to ensure timely and accurate collection of utilization and outcome data for <i>Early On</i>.</p>	<p>2006-2008 Completed</p>	<p>Part C Administrative Structure Michigan Part C data system contractor</p>
<p>Discussion: In addition to general Michigan Part C data system upgrades described under Indicator 1, updates to the data system will allow Michigan to collect more precise data on this indicator. The Michigan Part C data system will require local early intervention programs to enter the actual date of the receipt or completion of each portion of the evaluation and assessment process, the date of the initial IFSP meeting, the date of the completed IFSP, and also any exceptional family circumstances affecting the timeline. This will allow Michigan to notify local early intervention programs of findings in a more timely manner, report data from all 57 local early intervention programs for this indicator in the FFY 2009 APR, better analyze reasons for noncompliance, and provide additional data about the local early intervention programs.</p> <p>For the FFY 2008 APR to be submitted in February 2010, data for this indicator will be collected through the local self-assessment.</p>		
<p>Activity: The compliance portion of CIMS monitoring will address the 45-day timeline issue by collecting file review data from local early intervention programs.</p> <p>The data reported to MDE will be verified on a random basis. MDE will work with NCRRC to finalize the verification process in winter 2008.</p>	<p>Completed</p> <p>Winter 2007 and ongoing</p>	<p>CIMS contractor MDE staff</p>

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

<p>Discussion: The local self-assessment portion of CIMS began in the fall of 2007. One of the three cohorts, each of which consists of 19 of the 57 local early intervention programs, completed the Service Provider Self Review (SPSR). It included a child record review of 10%, or a minimum of ten files, which includes detailed questions regarding complete, multidisciplinary and timely evaluation and assessment, the initial IFSP meeting and the completed IFSP. The SPSR provided Michigan with additional data around evaluation, assessment and the 45-day timeline as well as allowing local early intervention programs an opportunity to evaluate their own systems and implement improvement activities in a proactive manner.</p> <p>The CIMS process, which began in April 2009, has each local early intervention program involved in data analysis. Each local early intervention program is required to analyze its data and if compliance is not met, complete activities. Activities include reviewing more recent data, participating in detailed technical assistance specific to the indicator where compliance has not been attained, and reviewing specific child records that the system instructs them to review. Verification will take place approximately eight months after the finding has been released and will require local early intervention programs to select specific records, as indicated by MDE, and send the records to MDE for verification. MDE uses a checklist, based upon federal regulations, to verify compliance. When correction of noncompliance is verified, a formal letter is sent to the local early intervention program closing the finding.</p>		
<p>Activity: A reference bulletin on the collection of vision and hearing information for the comprehensive evaluation of children will be developed and distributed to the field. It will include guidance to utilize existing hearing and vision reports from medical personnel before conducting hearing and vision screenings.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Interagency staff</p>
<p>Discussion: The hearing and vision reference bulletin was distributed in a draft form in the fall of 2006. In spring of 2008, the final version of the bulletin was provided to the field with limited edits.</p>		
<p>Activity: A State-recommended form for receiving health reports from medical personnel is being developed. A uniform process for requesting medical information may improve the completeness and timeliness of reports from health providers.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Interagency staff Community partners Appropriate stakeholders</p>
<p>Discussion: The State has decided to recommend the use of the Health Appraisal form currently used by all licensed child care providers in Michigan. The form has been posted on Michigan's CSPD contractor's website along with other State prototype forms. Local early intervention programs receiving determinations of Needs Assistance and Needs Intervention based on noncompliance with the 45-day timeline have received guidance on the use of the form, as well as best practices for ensuring the receipt of health information.</p>		
<p>Activity: Analyze data measuring this indicator and develop additional improvement activities.</p>	<p>Ongoing with annual review through 2012</p>	<p>Interagency staff Part C contractors MICC Stakeholders</p>
<p>Discussion: As evidenced in the APR, analysis of data from multiple sources related to the SPP indicators helped Michigan identify issues within the field that need additional guidance or dialogue and plan opportunities related to the indicators and Michigan's system of general supervision in order to correct noncompliance.</p>		
<p>Activity: Review fiscal costs and benefits of contracting regionalized nursing services to provide health information and complete vision and hearing checks.</p>	<p>Fall 2008-ongoing</p>	<p>MDE staff MICC Interagency staff Stakeholders</p>
<p>Discussion: This would lower Michigan's reliance on health providers who do not consider themselves or their services a part of the Part C system, and improve the rate of receipt of health information for inclusion in the evaluation for eligibility.</p>		
<p>Activity: Conduct a one day compliance conference for <i>Early On</i> coordinators and other stakeholders around the SPP indicators and Michigan's system of general supervision.</p>	<p>Completed Summer 2007</p>	<p>MDE staff CSPD contractor</p>

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan
State

<p>Discussion: With the distribution of “Determinations” in 2007, local early intervention programs became very interested in the SPP indicators and the consequences of noncompliance. By sharing detailed information with them, MDE is able to reinforce the importance of collecting valid and reliable data that demonstrate compliance and/or high performance on all SPP indicators. In 2008, a webinar was held to explain the process of “Determinations” with the local early intervention programs. In addition, specific activities that were required, based upon the determination level, were explained to the local early intervention programs.</p>		
<p>Activity: The CSPD contractor will develop an electronic system for tracking training and technical assistance provided to local early intervention programs by the contractor staff members or the State administrators.</p>	<p>Winter 2008</p>	<p>MDE staff Interagency staff CSPD contractor Grant manager</p>
<p>Discussion: The system will allow the CSPD contractor to provide information on training and technical assistance when requested, sorted by local early intervention program or topic. MDE will then be able to analyze these data for multiple purposes.</p>		
<p>Activity: MDE, State-level partners, and contractors will continue to improve communication with health professionals.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>MDE staff Interagency staff CSPD contractor</p>
<p>Discussion: This is another strategy for increasing the availability of health information in a timely manner for inclusion in the evaluation of eligibility.</p>		
<p>Activity: Update and re-distribute the reference bulletin regarding the definition of ‘central file’ and which documents are required to be a part of that file.</p>	<p>Completed Fall 2008</p>	<p>MDE staff Interagency staff CSPD contractor Michigan Part C data system contractor</p>
<p>Discussion: The analysis of available data demonstrates the need for clarification to the field on exactly what is required to be included in each child’s central file. The requirement to keep documentation of any exceptional family circumstances in the central file will positively impact compliance with this indicator.</p>		
<p>Activity: Develop and distribute guidance to the field on how and when to close out referrals and track them in the Michigan Part C data system.</p>	<p>Completed Spring 2008</p>	<p>MDE staff Michigan Part C data system contractor CSPD contractor</p>
<p>Discussion: The analysis of data shows inconsistency across local early intervention programs in entering, tracking, and closing out referrals in the Michigan Part C data system. This is negatively affecting the State’s compliance with this indicator.</p>		
<p>Activity: Develop and distribute a reference bulletin focusing on the minimum follow-up to referrals when the parents are difficult to reach or the referral comes without sufficient contact information; and on what constitutes a referral.</p>	<p>Completed Spring 2008</p>	<p>MDE staff Interagency staff CSPD contractor</p>
<p>Discussion: The analysis of data shows confusion across the state in policies and procedures regarding referrals. This is negatively affecting the State’s compliance with this indicator.</p>		
<p>Activity: Develop a frequently asked questions web page that can be accessed by local early intervention programs and updated as needed by MDE.</p>	<p>Summer 2008 Ongoing</p>	<p>MDE staff (ECE&FS and OSE/EIS) Interagency staff CSPD contractor Michigan Part C data system contractor Child and Family Outcomes contractor</p>
<p>Discussion: This will allow easy access to frequently asked questions to everyone in the <i>Early On</i> field and ensure that consistent answers are provided. Tracking the frequency of questions will also help the State to determine when a reference bulletin is necessary.</p>		
<p>Activity: Update Michigan’s Part C data system to include dates for the initial IFSP meeting and completion date of the IFSP.</p>	<p>2009</p>	<p>MDE staff Michigan Part C data system</p>

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan
State

Discussion: In FFY 2009, Michigan added a field to its data system to accurately account for timely services. Training began in FFY 2009 and will continue. Beginning July 1, 2010, all local early intervention programs are required to enter these data into the data system. The FFY 2010 APR will use the Michigan data system to collect this information.		
Activity: Add component in the CIMS system to validate data entered into Michigan's Part C data system.	2010-2012	MDE staff CIMS contractor
Discussion: Beginning in FFY 2009, CIMS added a component to allow local early intervention programs to validate data. In FFY 2009, pilot sites were chosen to complete this activity. Beginning in FFY 2010, all local early intervention programs are required to complete validation activities through CIMS.		
Activity: Update Michigan's Part C data system to allow local early intervention systems to enter exceptional family circumstances.	2010-2012	MDE staff Michigan Part C data system
Discussion: Beginning in FFY 2009, one of the fields available in Michigan's data system was the reason for late services. Local early intervention programs are required to enter this field as of July 1, 2010.		
Activity: Update Michigan's Part C data system to allow local early intervention programs to generate reports to indicate when timelines need to be met.	2010-2012	MDE staff Michigan Part C data system
Discussion: The Michigan Part C data system allows local early intervention programs to generate reports for a variety of activities. Local early intervention programs can create lists for timelines. This will help local early intervention programs with compliance indicators.		
Activity: Train local early intervention programs to use all components of Michigan's Part C data system.	2010-ongoing	MDE staff Michigan Part C data system
Discussion: Training local early intervention programs on the new components of the Part C data system as well as CIMS will allow the programs to utilize the enhancements to ensure compliance.		

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2010 (if applicable):

No revisions at this time.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See page 1 of this APR.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/Effective Transition

Indicator 8a: Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:
 a) IFSPs with transition steps and services
 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:
 Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009:

99.33%

Data were collected in MEGS through a local self-assessment. Local early intervention programs were required to select a random representative sample of children. Local early intervention programs were required to sample 10% of their snapshot number or a minimum of ten records, whichever was greater. The records were a representative sample chosen from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010.

Children Exiting Part C who Received Timely Transition Planning:

a. Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	598
b. Number of children exiting Part C	602
Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday (Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100)	99.33%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

During FFY 2009, Michigan was in the process of updating the Michigan Part C data system to include the collection of data regarding transitions; details of Michigan's progress with the upgrades are provided in the discussion of the planned improvement activities in this indicator. In order to collect data for this indicator, the State collected data through a local self-assessment in MEGS. For this data collection activity, each local early intervention program was instructed to select a representative sample of 10%, or no less than ten children, for small local early intervention programs, based on gender, ethnicity, eligibility (Part C or Part C and Michigan Special Education), and age.

The near maintenance in performance rate in Indicator 8a in FFY 2009 as compared to FFY 2008 may be attributed to a number of factors. Michigan's CSPD grantee held several trainings around the State to ensure that local early intervention programs understood the requirements for transition planning as well as a transition conference, for those children potentially eligible for Part B services. In particular, training targeted how to document exceptional family circumstances and what must occur in the transition process. In addition, the State revised its requirement for identifying findings. The State also revised its requirements for response to findings from each local early intervention program. Based on this new approach, each local early intervention program was required to submit, for approval, an improvement plan that detailed strategies that the local early intervention program was required to accomplish in order to correct noncompliance, as soon as possible, but no later than one year from notification of the finding, including verification by the State. The slight decrease in performance for Indicator 8c may be attributed to staff turnover in the local early intervention programs.

Michigan did not meet the target of 100% compliance with this indicator. Through local self-assessment, details on exceptional family circumstances were recorded and included in the FFY 2009 calculation. Of the 16 children who did not receive timely transition planning, 12 had exceptional family circumstances documented in the file. They included requests from parents to wait on transition planning, hospitalization of children, and parents not home. The four children who did not have timely transition planning initiated and did not have an exceptional family circumstance received the required transition planning indicated on their IFSPs. As part of the local self-assessment in MEGS, early intervention programs were asked to document the cause for the delay. Staff unavailable or sick was the reason in all instances for a delay in timely transition planning. In addition, as part of the local self-assessment in MEGS, early intervention programs had to indicate whether the child received transition planning, in all cases the child did receive transition planning indicated on his/her IFSP.

Three local early intervention programs were issued findings in FFY 2009 and had to submit, for approval, corrective action plans in the CIMS-2 system that detailed strategies that the local early intervention program would take to correct noncompliance, as soon as possible, but no later than one year from notification of the finding, including verification by the State. As part of the corrective action planning process, progress reports were submitted. Local early intervention programs were provided assistance by local regional monitors to develop corrective action plans and correct individual and systemic noncompliance. Progress reports required the local early intervention program to conduct file reviews. As part of the corrective action planning process, local early intervention programs are required to conduct file reviews as part of the quarterly reporting process. When data from progress reports indicate correction of noncompliance has been met, MDE requires early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency for verification of correction of noncompliance. This requires the local early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency which uses a checklist to verify correction of noncompliance. The checklist is based upon federal guidelines.

MDE requested that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever was greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the federal and state standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. Verification involves review of a sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(4), 303.344(h), and 303.148(b)(2)(i).

Local early intervention programs are notified of the verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter closing the corrective action plan.

Of 57 local early intervention programs monitored for compliance regarding the timely transition planning and conference in FFY 2008, none were found to be out of compliance with Indicators 8a and 8c.

Local early intervention programs that have not verified correction of noncompliance will have sanctions enforced, which may include being focused monitored, a compliance agreement, or intensive State supervision.

As part of the corrective action planning process, local early intervention programs are required to conduct file reviews as part of the quarterly reporting process. Local early intervention programs were provided assistance by local regional monitors to develop corrective action plans and correct individual and systemic noncompliance. When data from progress reports indicate correction of noncompliance has been met, MDE requires early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency for verification of correction of noncompliance. This requires the local early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency which uses a checklist to verify correction of noncompliance. The checklist is based upon federal guidelines. Local early intervention programs are notified of the verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter closing the corrective action plan.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):
Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2008 for this indicator: 99.20%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2008 (the period from July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009)	0
2. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	0
3. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

4. Number of FFY 2008 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	0
6. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

In FFY 2008, the State did not meet its target of 100%. No new findings were issued for Indicator 8a in FFY 2008. The actual target data in FFY 2009 of 99.33% is a result of continued FFY 2007 noncompliance. As reported in the FFY 2008 APR all instances of noncompliance have been corrected.

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

All local early intervention programs that received findings were required to submit corrective action plans using the CIMS-2 system. In addition, progress reporting was required for those local early intervention programs where verification of correction of noncompliance had not been submitted to MDE. When data from progress reports indicated correction of noncompliance had been met, MDE required early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency for verification of correction of noncompliance. This required the local early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency that uses a checklist, based on federal requirements, to verify correction of noncompliance.

MDE requested that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever was greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the federal and state standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. Verification involves review of a sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.321 (e)(2), 303.322 (e)(1), and 303.342(a).

Local early intervention programs are notified of the verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter closing the corrective action plan. In addition, the finding is closed out in the CIMS-2 system. For those local early intervention programs that did not meet their interim targets and compliance, sanctions are enforced which may include being focused monitored, a compliance agreement, or intensive State supervision. Additional assistance to local programs was provided by local regional monitoring staff on how to correct for individual noncompliance and how to develop practices to assure ongoing compliance.

Verification of Correction of FFY 2008 noncompliance or FFY 2008 findings (either timely or subsequent):

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8a.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008:

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8a.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):

All local early intervention programs that were issued findings in FFY 2007 have corrected noncompliance. Reporting on all local early intervention programs issued findings for Indicator 8a, were reported as corrected in the FFY 2008 APR.

1. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP's June 2010, FFY 2008 APR response table for this indicator	9
2. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings the State has verified as corrected	9

3. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0
--	----------

Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 findings:

Of 57 local early intervention programs monitored for compliance with providing a transition plan with steps and services, nine were found to be out of compliance in June 2007. Seven programs were verified for correction of noncompliance within one year. The remaining two local early intervention programs were able to show progress, but not compliance within one year of notification of the finding. These two local early intervention programs were required to update/revise their corrective action plans and turn in monthly progress reports. To verify correction of noncompliance, MDE requires the local early intervention program to submit files and MDE verifies correction of noncompliance by using the checklist based upon federal requirements. Each local early intervention program, for which correction of noncompliance has been verified, receives a letter closing the finding. All findings of noncompliance were verified and closed as of January 2009. All local early intervention programs issued findings in FFY 2007 for Indicator 8a have been corrected and reported as corrected in the FFY 2008 APR.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007:

Each local early intervention program that was issued a finding in FFY 2007 had to submit, for approval, a corrective action plan in the CIMS-2 system that detailed strategies the local early intervention program was to take to correct noncompliance, as soon as possible, but no later than one year from notification of the finding, including verification by the State. As part of the corrective action planning process, progress reports were submitted. Local early intervention programs were provided assistance by local regional monitors to develop corrective action plans and correct individual and systemic noncompliance. Progress reports required the local early intervention program to conduct file reviews. When progress reports indicated compliance or that a State target had been met, MDE required early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency for verification of correction of noncompliance. A sample of records was sent to MDE and MDE used a checklist to verify correction of noncompliance.

MDE requested that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever was greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the federal and state standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. Verification involves review of a sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1).

Local early intervention programs are notified of the outcome of verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter. The collection of exceptional family circumstances helps compliance with this indicator. Another reason for the progress in this indicator is the training and technical assistance provided by the State and the training entity.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2006 or Earlier (if applicable):

All findings of noncompliance have been verified and correction has taken place. All findings from FFY 2006 or earlier have been reported as corrected in the FFY 2008 APR.

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the IFSP transition content requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4), 303.344(h). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p>	<p>Michigan has verified correction of noncompliance for all local early intervention programs that were issued findings in FFY 2007. No findings were issued in FFY 2008, all noncompliance was continued noncompliance. The State reported the correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2008 APR.</p>
<p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4), 303.344(h) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program (i.e., the child has exited the State's Part C program due to age or other reasons), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>	<p>MDE requests that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever is greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the federal and state standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. Verification involves review of a sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1).</p> <p>Local early intervention programs are notified of the outcome of verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter. The collection of exceptional family circumstances helps compliance with this indicator. Another reason for the progress in this indicator is the training and technical assistance provided by the State and the training entity.</p> <p>When conducting on-site monitoring, the State issues Child Level Corrective Action Plans for all instances where the child has not received timely transition planning, including steps and services. The local early intervention program has 30 days to implement the activity/activities and send to the State evidence that the activity/activities took place. In addition, in the MEGS local self-assessment, the State asks that for all children where timely transition planning was not met, did the child receive the required activity/activities. In all instances, the children received the required transition plan, with steps and services.</p>
<p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>	<p>The State has reviewed the improvement activities for this indicator.</p>

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2009:

The following activities were included in the FFY 2008 APR and in the SPP that was updated in February 2010. An update on the progress of each activity is included.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Activity: The <i>Early On</i> system will implement the new monitoring system, CIMS, with transition as a priority area.	Completed	CIMS contractor
Discussion: Three of the five local early intervention programs identified for focused monitoring through the determination process in fall 2008 were selected in part for their noncompliance with transition activities. Their focused monitoring reports will require compliance within one year from notification. Verification visits took place in FFY 2009.		
Activity: The <i>Early On</i> system will update and broadly disseminate written guidance regarding requirements and research-based practices for transitioning. It will include specifics required to meet compliance for timelines, transition steps and services, and the transition conference.	Completed Fall 2008	<i>Early On</i> Redesign Leadership Team MICC National Early Childhood Transition Center Contractors Parents Advocacy organizations
Discussion: The <i>Timely Services Reference Bulletin</i> was distributed in December 2006 and addressed the timelines associated with transitions and exceptional family circumstances. Additionally, Michigan participated in the National Early Childhood Transition Center's recent research and received feedback from that project which will be used to develop additional guidance around transition.		
Activity: The Michigan Part C data system will be upgraded to ensure timely and accurate collection of utilization and outcome data for <i>Early On</i> .	2006-2008 Ongoing	Part C Administrative Structure Michigan Part C data system contractor
<p>Discussion: In addition to general Michigan Part C data system upgrades described under Indicator 1, updates to the data system will allow Michigan to include details of transition planning and the date of the transition conference. In addition, the system will collect data related to exceptional family circumstances. This will allow Michigan to notify service areas of findings in a more timely manner, report compliance data for all 57 service areas for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR to be submitted in February 2010, better analyze reasons for non-compliance, and provide additional data about the local early intervention programs.</p> <p>For the FFY 2007 APR, data for this indicator were collected through the Service Provider Self Review (SPSR). One cohort of 19 local early intervention programs completed and submitted the SPSR, including child record review results, in spring 2008. The other two cohorts completed and submitted self assessments in spring 2008.</p> <p>The process of upgrading the Michigan Part C data system has been time and resource consuming at the State and local level. Adding fields to a web-based data collection system is approximately a three-year process. One year is required to program and pilot the changes. Another year is needed to train staff and provide technical assistance to get valid and reliable data. Finally, in the third year, data will be available for reporting.</p>		
Activity: The <i>Early On</i> system will focus on strengthening partnerships between Part C and Part B personnel at the State, ISD, and LEA levels and with community partners.	Ongoing	MDE staff Head Start Local early intervention programs Michigan 4C's Other community partners
Discussion: During FFY 2006, communication was increased with ISD Special Education Directors through the use of monthly conference calls with <i>Early On</i> being one of the standing agenda items. Additionally, Part C MDE staff members attended the annual ISD Special Education Monitors meeting to share Part C developments. Finally, the Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services contracted a Part C monitoring consultant to facilitate communication between Part B and Part C at the State level. In FFY 2007, Michigan <i>Early On</i> attended multiple ISD Special Education Director meetings and developed a stakeholder group including both local <i>Early On</i> Coordinators and ISD Special Education Directors to provide insight on the local ramifications of State policy and procedure changes.		

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan
State

Activity: The <i>Early On</i> system will make available learning opportunities for families to partner in the transition process.	Ongoing	Families PTI Contractors MICC/Parent Involvement Committee National Early Childhood Transition Center
Discussion: The CSPD, PTI, and parent support contractors will work together to provide a Parent Institute in spring 2008 that will provide an overview of the Part C system including parent rights throughout the process. Due to a low response rate, the Parent Institute did not take place.		
Activity: Develop Requests for Proposal (RFPs) for training and technical assistance, and child find and public awareness contracts.	Completed May 2007	Interagency staff
Activity: Award training and technical assistance, and child find and public awareness contracts.	Completed October 2007	MDE staff
Discussion: The RFPs for training and technical assistance, and child find and public awareness were developed and awarded in FFY 2006. The revised systems began operating October 1, 2007. The previous CSPD contractor was again awarded both the training and technical assistance and the child find and public awareness contracts.		
Activity: Analyze data measuring this indicator and develop additional improvement activities.	Ongoing with annual review through 2012	Interagency staff Part C contractors MICC Stakeholders
Discussion: As evidenced in the APR, analysis of data from multiple sources related to the SPP indicators helped Michigan identify issues within the field that need additional guidance or dialogue and plan opportunities related to the indicators and Michigan's system of general supervision in order to correct noncompliance.		
Activity: Update Michigan's Part C data system to include email notification to the LEA for local early intervention programs for children who are potentially eligible for Part B.	2009	MDE Staff Michigan Part C data system
Discussion: In FFY 2009, Michigan added a field to its data system to accurately account for timely transition planning. Training began in FFY 2009 and will continue. Beginning July 1, 2010, all local early intervention programs are required to enter these data into the data system. The FFY 2010 APR will use the Michigan data system to collect this information.		
Activity: Add component in the CIMS system to validate data entered into Michigan's Part C data system.	2010-2012	MDE staff CIMS contractor
Discussion: Beginning in FFY 2009, CIMS added a component to allow local early intervention programs to validate data. In FFY 2009, pilot sites were chosen to complete this activity. Beginning in FFY 2010, all local early intervention programs are required to complete validation activities through CIMS.		
Activity: Update Michigan's Part C data system to allow local early intervention systems to enter exceptional family circumstances.	2010-2012	MDE Staff Michigan Part C data system
Discussion: Beginning in FFY 2009, one of the fields available in Michigan's data system was the reason for late services. Local early intervention programs are required to enter this field as of July 1, 2010.		
Activity: Update Michigan's Part C data system to allow local early intervention programs to generate reports to indicate when timelines need to be met.	2010-2012	MDE Staff Michigan Part C data system
Discussion: The Michigan Part C data system allows local early intervention programs to generate reports for a variety of activities. Local early intervention programs can create lists for timelines. This will help local early intervention programs with compliance indicators.		

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Activity: Train local early intervention programs to use all components of Michigan's Part C data system.	2010-ongoing	MDE Staff Michigan Part C data system
Discussion: Training local early intervention programs on the new components of the Part C data system as well as CIMS will allow the programs to utilize the enhancements to ensure compliance.		

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2010 (if applicable):

No revisions at this time.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See page 1 of this APR.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/Effective Transition

Indicator 8b: Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:
 b) Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B;
 20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the notification to the LEA occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009:

100%

Data were collected in MEGS through a local self-assessment. Local early intervention programs were required to select a random representative sample of children. Local early intervention programs were required to sample 10% of their snapshot number or a minimum of 10 records, whichever was greater. The records were a representative sample chosen from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010.

Children Exiting Part C who Received Timely Transition Planning (Notification to LEA):

a. Number of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the notification to the LEA occurred	410
b. Number of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	410
Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday (Notification to LEA) (Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100)	100%

Given that Michigan is a birth mandate state and the Part C local lead agency is the ISD, notification from Part C is internal and takes place as the child is identified as potentially Michigan Special Education eligible at any time from birth to age three years. Any child found eligible for Michigan Special Education is automatically transitioned into Part B Special Education by age three. “The school district of residence is responsible for conducting the initial individualized education program team meeting involving a student

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan
State

in its district and shall conduct, or authorize the operating district to conduct, each subsequent individualized education program team meeting at a mutually agreed upon time and place.” Michigan Special Education Rule R 340.1721c. Therefore, LEAs are notified of **100%** of children potentially eligible for Part B.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2009:

During FFY 2009, Michigan was in the process of updating the Michigan Part C data system to include the collection of data regarding transitions; details of Michigan’s progress with the upgrades are provided in the discussion of the planned improvement activities in this indicator. In order to collect data for this indicator, the State collected data through a local self-assessment in MEGS. For this data collection activity, each local early intervention program was instructed to select a representative sample of 10%, or no less than ten children for small local early intervention programs, based on gender, ethnicity, eligibility (Part C or Part C and Michigan Special Education), and age.

The near maintenance of compliance in Indicator 8c in FFY 2009 may be attributed to a number of factors. Michigan’s CSPD grantee held several trainings around the state to ensure that local early intervention programs understood the requirements for transition planning as well as a transition conference, for those children potentially eligible for Part B services. In particular, training targeted how to document exceptional family circumstances and what must occur in the transition process. In addition, the State revised its requirement for identifying findings. The State also revised its requirements for response to findings from each local early intervention program. Based on this new approach, each local early intervention program was required to submit for approval, a corrective action plan that detailed strategies that the local early intervention program was required to accomplish in order to correct noncompliance, as soon as possible, but no later than one year from notification of the finding, including verification by the State.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance): Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2008 for this indicator: 100%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2008 (the period from July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009)	0
2. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	0
3. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

4. Number of FFY 2008 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	0
6. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8b.

Verification of Correction of FFY 2008 noncompliance or FFY 2008 findings (either timely or subsequent):

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8b.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008:

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8b.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8b.

Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 findings:

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8b.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007:

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8b.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2006 or Earlier (if applicable):

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8b.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2009:

The following activities were included in the FFY 2008 APR and in the SPP that was updated in February 2010. An update on the progress of each activity is included.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Activity: The <i>Early On</i> system will implement the new monitoring system, CIMS, with transition as a priority area.	Completed	CIMS contractor
Discussion: Three of the five local early intervention programs identified for focused monitoring through the determination process in fall 2008 were selected in part for their noncompliance with transition activities. Their focused monitoring reports will require compliance within one year from notification. Verification visits took place in FFY 2009.		
Activity: The <i>Early On</i> system will update and broadly disseminate written guidance regarding requirements and research-based practices for transitioning. The guidance will include specifics required to meet compliance for timelines, transition steps and services, and the transition conference.	Completed Fall 2008	<i>Early On</i> Redesign Leadership Team MICC National Early Childhood Transition Center Contractors Parents Advocacy organizations

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

<p>Discussion: The <i>Timely Services Reference Bulletin</i> was distributed in December 2006 and addressed the timelines associated with transitions and exceptional family circumstances. Additionally, Michigan participated in the National Early Childhood Transition Center's recent research and received feedback from that project which will be used to develop additional guidance around transition.</p>		
<p>Activity: The Michigan Part C data system will be upgraded to ensure timely and accurate collection of utilization and outcome data for <i>Early On</i>.</p>	<p>2006 - 2008 Ongoing</p>	<p>Part C Administrative Structure Michigan Part C data system contractor</p>
<p>Discussion: In addition to general Michigan Part C data system upgrades described under Indicator 1, updates to the data system will allow Michigan to include details of transition planning and the date of the transition conference. In addition, the system will collect data related to exceptional family circumstances. This will allow Michigan to notify service areas of findings in a more timely manner, report compliance data for all 57 service areas for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR to be submitted in February 2010, better analyze reasons for non-compliance, and provide additional data about the local early intervention programs.</p> <p>For the FFY 2007 APR, data for this indicator were collected through the Service Provider Self Review (SPSR). One cohort of 19 local early intervention programs completed and submitted the SPSR, including child record review results, in spring 2008. The other two cohorts completed and submitted self assessments in spring 2008.</p> <p>The process of upgrading the Michigan Part C data system has been time and resource consuming at the State and local level. Adding fields to a web-based data collection system is approximately a three-year process. One year is required to program and pilot the changes. Another year is needed to train staff and provide technical assistance to get valid and reliable data. Finally, in the third year, data will be available for reporting.</p>		
<p>Activity: The <i>Early On</i> system will focus on strengthening partnerships between Part C and Part B personnel at the State, ISD, and LEA levels and with community partners.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>MDE staff Head Start Local early intervention programs Michigan 4C's Other community partners</p>
<p>Discussion: During FFY 2006, communication was increased with ISD Special Education Directors through the use of monthly conference calls with <i>Early On</i> being one of the standing agenda items. Additionally, Part C MDE staff members attended the annual ISD Special Education Monitors meeting to share Part C developments. Finally, the Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services contracted a Part C monitoring consultant to facilitate communication between Part B and Part C at the State level. In FFY 2007, Michigan <i>Early On</i> attended multiple ISD Special Education Director meetings and developed a stakeholder group including both local <i>Early On</i> coordinators and ISD Special Education Directors to provide insight on the local ramifications of State policy and procedure changes.</p>		
<p>Activity: The <i>Early On</i> system will make available learning opportunities for families to partner in the transition process.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Families PTI Contractors MICC/Parent Involvement Committee National Early Childhood Transition Center</p>
<p>Discussion: The CSPD, PTI, and parent support contractors will work together to provide a Parent Institute in the spring of 2008 that will provide an overview of the Part C system including parent rights throughout the process.</p> <p>Due to a low response rate, the Parent Institute did not take place.</p>		
<p>Activity: Develop Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for training and technical assistance, and child find and public awareness contracts.</p>	<p>Completed May 2007</p>	<p>Interagency staff</p>
<p>Activity: Award training and technical assistance, and child find and public awareness contracts.</p>	<p>Completed October 2007</p>	<p>MDE staff</p>
<p>Discussion: The RFPs for training and technical assistance and child find and public awareness were developed and awarded in FFY 2006. The revised systems began operating October 1, 2007. The previous CSPD contractor was again awarded both the training and technical assistance and the child find and public awareness contracts.</p>		

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan
State

Activity: Analyze data measuring this indicator and develop additional improvement activities.	Ongoing with annual review through 2012	Interagency staff Part C contractors MICC Stakeholders
Discussion: As evidenced in the APR, analysis of data from multiple sources related to the SPP indicators helped Michigan identify issues within the field that need additional guidance or dialogue and plan opportunities related to the indicators and Michigan's system of general supervision in order to correct noncompliance.		
Activity: Update Michigan's Part C data system to include email notification to the LEA for local early intervention programs for children who are potentially eligible for Part B.	2009	MDE Staff Michigan Part C data system
Discussion: In FFY 2009, Michigan added a field to its data system to accurately account for timely transition planning. Training began in FFY 2009 and will continue. Beginning July 1, 2010, all local early intervention programs are required to enter these data into the data system. The FFY 2010 APR will use the Michigan data system to collect this information.		
Activity: Add component in the CIMS system to validate data entered into Michigan's Part C data system.	2010-2012	MDE staff CIMS contractor
Discussion: Beginning in FFY 2009, CIMS added a component to allow local early intervention programs to validate data. In FFY 2009, pilot sites were chosen to complete this activity. Beginning in FFY 2010, all local early intervention programs are required to complete validation activities through CIMS.		
Activity: Update Michigan's Part C data system to allow local early intervention systems to enter exceptional family circumstances.	2010-2012	MDE Staff Michigan Part C data system
Discussion: Beginning in FFY 2009, one of the fields available in Michigan's data system was added, that being the reason for late services. Local early intervention programs are required to enter this field as of July 1, 2010.		
Activity: Update Michigan's Part C data system to allow local early intervention programs to generate reports to indicate when timelines need to be met.	2010-2012	MDE Staff Michigan Part C data system
Discussion: The Michigan Part C data system allows local early intervention programs to generate reports for a variety of activities. Local early intervention programs can create lists for timelines. This will help local early intervention programs with compliance indicators.		
Activity: Train local early intervention programs to use all components of Michigan's Part C data system.	2010-ongoing	MDE Staff Michigan Part C data system
Discussion: Training local early intervention programs on the new components of the Part C data system as well as CIMS will allow the programs to utilize the enhancements to ensure compliance.		

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2010 (if applicable):

No revisions at this time.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See page 1 of this APR.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/Effective Transition

Indicator 8c: Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:
 c) Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.
 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition conferences, including reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009:

99.26%

Data were collected in MEGS through a local self-assessment. Local early intervention programs were required to select a random representative sample of children. Local early intervention programs were required to sample 10% of their snapshot number or a minimum of 10 records, whichever was greater. The records were a representative sample chosen from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010.

Children Exiting Part C who Received Timely Transition Planning (Transition Conference):

a. Number of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred	407
b. Number of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	410
Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday (Transition Conference) (Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100)	99.26%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2009:

During FFY 2009, Michigan was in the process of updating the Michigan Part C data system to include the collection of data regarding transitions; details of Michigan's progress with the upgrades are provided in the discussion of the planned improvement activities in this indicator. In order to collect data for this indicator, the State collected data through a local self-assessment in MEGS. For this data collection activity, each local early intervention program was instructed to select a representative sample of 10%, or no less than ten children for small local early intervention programs, based on gender, ethnicity, eligibility (Part C or Part C and Michigan Special Education), and age.

The slight decrease in performance rate in Indicator 8c in FFY 2009 as compared to FFY 2008 may be attributed to Michigan's turnover rate of staff.

Michigan's CSPD grantee held several trainings around the state to ensure that local early intervention programs understood the requirements for transition planning as well as a transition conference, for those children potentially eligible for Part B services. In particular, training targeted how to document exceptional family circumstances and what must occur in the transition process. In addition, the State revised its requirement for identifying findings. The State also revised its requirements for response to findings from each local early intervention program. Based on this new approach, each local early intervention program was required to submit for approval, an improvement plan that detailed strategies that the local early intervention program was required to accomplish in order to correct noncompliance, as soon as possible, but no later than one year from notification of the finding, including verification by the State. The slight decrease in performance for Indicator 8c may be attributed to staff turnover in the local early intervention programs.

Michigan did not meet the target of 100% compliance with this indicator. Through self assessment, details on exceptional family circumstances were recorded and included in the FFY 2009 calculation. Of the nine children who did not receive timely transition conferences, six had exceptional family circumstances documented in the file. They included requests from parents to wait on transition planning, hospitalization of children, and parents not home. The three children who did not have timely transition conferences initiated and did not have an exceptional family circumstance received transition conferences indicated on their IFSP. As part of the local self-assessment in MEGS, early intervention programs were asked to document the cause for the delay. Staff unavailable or sick was the reason in all instances for a delay in timely transition conferences. In addition, as part of the local self-assessment in MEGS, early intervention programs were required to indicate whether the child received a timely transition conference; in all cases the child did receive the transition conference indicated on their IFSP.

Two local early intervention programs were issued findings in FFY 2009 and had to submit, for approval, corrective action plans in the CIMS-2 system that detailed strategies that the local early intervention program would take to correct noncompliance, as soon as possible, but no later than one year from notification of the finding, including verification by the State. As part of the corrective action planning process, progress reports were submitted. Local early intervention programs were provided assistance by local regional monitors to develop corrective action plans and correct individual and systemic noncompliance. Progress reports required the local early intervention program to conduct file reviews. As part of the corrective action planning process, local early intervention programs are required to conduct file reviews as part of the quarterly reporting process. When data from progress reports indicate correction of noncompliance has been met, MDE requires early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency for verification of correction of noncompliance. This requires the local early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency which uses a checklist to verify correction of noncompliance. The checklist is based upon federal guidelines.

MDE requested that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever was greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the federal and state standards when reviewing each set

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan
State

of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. Verification involves review of a sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(4), 303.344(h), and 303.148(b)(2)(i).

Local early intervention programs are notified of the verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter closing the corrective action plan.

Of 57 local early intervention programs monitored for compliance regarding the timely transition planning and conference in FFY 2008, none were found to be out of compliance with Indicators 8a and 8c.

Local early intervention programs that have not verified correction of noncompliance will have sanctions enforced, which may include being focused monitored, a compliance agreement, or intensive State supervision.

As part of the corrective action planning process, local early intervention programs are required to conduct file reviews as part of the quarterly reporting process. Local early intervention programs were provided assistance by local regional monitors to develop corrective action plans and correct individual and systemic noncompliance. When data from progress reports indicate correction of noncompliance has been met, MDE requires early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency for verification of correction of noncompliance. This requires the local early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency which uses a checklist to verify correction of noncompliance. The checklist is based upon federal guidelines. Local early intervention programs are notified of the verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter closing the corrective action plan.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):
Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2008 for this indicator: 99.70%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2008 (the period from July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009)	0
2. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	0
3. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

4. Number of FFY 2008 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	0
6. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

In FFY 2008, the State did not meet its target of 100%. No new findings were issued for Indicator 8c in FFY 2008. The actual target data in FFY 2009 of 99.26% is a result of continued FFY 2007 noncompliance. As reported in the FFY 2008 APR all instances of noncompliance have been corrected.

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

All local early intervention programs that received findings were required to submit corrective action plans using the CIMS-2 system. In addition, progress reporting was required for those local early intervention programs where verification of correction of noncompliance had not been submitted to MDE. When data from progress reports indicated correction of noncompliance had been met, MDE required early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency for verification of correction of noncompliance. This required the local early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency that uses a checklist, based on federal requirements, to verify correction of noncompliance.

MDE requested that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever was greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the federal and State standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. Verification involves review of a sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.321 (e)(2), 303.322 (e)(1), and 303.342(a).

Local early intervention programs are notified of the verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter closing the corrective action plan. In addition, the finding is closed out in the CIMS-2 system. For those local early intervention programs that did not meet their interim targets and compliance, sanctions will be enforced which may include being focused monitored, a compliance agreement, or intensive State supervision. Additional assistance to local programs was provided by local regional monitoring staff on how to correct for individual noncompliance and how to develop practices to assure ongoing compliance.

Verification of Correction of FFY 2008 noncompliance or FFY 2008 findings (either timely or subsequent):

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8c.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008:

All local early intervention programs were in compliance with regard to Indicator 8c.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):

All local early intervention programs that were issued findings in FFY 2007 have corrected noncompliance. Reporting on all local early intervention programs issued findings for Indicator 8c, were reported as corrected in the FFY 2008 APR.

1. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP's June 2010, FFY 2008 APR response table for this indicator	8
2. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings the State has verified as corrected	8

3. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0
--	----------

Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 findings:

Of 57 local early intervention programs monitored for compliance with providing a transition plan with steps and services, nine were found to be out of compliance in June 2007. Seven programs were verified for correction of noncompliance within one year. The remaining two local early intervention programs were able to show progress, but not compliance within one year of notification of the finding. The two local early intervention programs were required to update/revise their corrective action plans and turn in progress reports monthly. To verify correction of noncompliance, MDE requires the local early intervention program to submit files and MDE verifies correction of noncompliance by using the checklist based upon federal requirements. Each local early intervention program, for which correction of noncompliance has been verified, receives a letter closing the finding. All findings of noncompliance were verified and closed as of January 2009.

All local early intervention programs issued findings in FFY 2007 for Indicator 8c have been corrected and reported as corrected in the FFY 2008 APR.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007:

Each local early intervention program that was issued a finding in FFY 2007 had to submit, for approval, a corrective action plan in the CIMS-2 system that detailed strategies that the local early intervention program was to take to correct noncompliance, as soon as possible, but no later than one year from notification of the finding, including verification by the State. As part of the corrective action planning process, progress reports were submitted. Local early intervention programs were provided assistance by local regional monitors to develop corrective action plans and correct individual and systemic noncompliance. Progress reports required the local early intervention program to conduct file reviews. When progress reports indicated compliance or that a State target had been met, MDE required early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency for verification of correction of noncompliance. A sample of records was sent to MDE and MDE used a checklist to verify correction of noncompliance.

MDE requested that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever was greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the federal and State standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. Verification involves review of a sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1).

Local early intervention programs are notified of the outcome of verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter. The collection of exceptional family circumstances helps compliance with this indicator. Another reason for the progress in this indicator is the training and technical assistance provided by the State and the training entity.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2006 or Earlier (if applicable):

All findings of noncompliance have been verified and correction has taken place. All findings from FFY 2006 or earlier have been reported as corrected in the FFY 2008 APR.

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely transition conference requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p>	<p>Michigan has verified correction of noncompliance for all local early intervention programs that were issued findings in FFY 2007. No findings were issued in FFY 2008, all noncompliance was continued noncompliance. The State reported the correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2008 APR.</p>
<p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has conducted a transition conference, although late, for any child potentially eligible for Part B whose transition conference was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 9-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify correction.</p>	<p>MDE requests that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever is greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the federal and State standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. Verification involves review of a sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1).</p> <p>Local early intervention programs are notified of the outcome of verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter. The collection of exceptional family circumstances helps compliance with this indicator. Another reason for the progress in this indicator is the training and technical assistance provided by the State and the training entity.</p> <p>When conducting on-site monitoring, the State issues Child Level Corrective Action Plans for all instances where the child has not received a timely transition conference. The local early intervention program has 30 days to implement the activity/activities and send to the State evidence that the activity/activities took place. In addition, in the MEGS local self-assessment, the State asks that for all children where timely transition conference was not met, did the child receive the required activity/activities. In all instances, the children received the required transition conferences.</p>
<p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>	<p>The State has reviewed the improvement activities for this indicator.</p>

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2009:

The following activities were included in the FFY 2008 APR and in the SPP that was updated in February 2010. An update on the progress of each activity is included.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Activity: The <i>Early On</i> system will implement the new monitoring system, CIMS, with transition as a priority area.	Completed	CIMS contractor
Discussion: Three of the five local early intervention programs identified for focused monitoring through the determination process in fall 2008 were selected in part for their noncompliance with transition activities. Their focused monitoring reports will require compliance within one year from notification. Verification visits took place in FFY 2009.		
Activity: The <i>Early On</i> system will update and broadly disseminate written guidance regarding requirements and research-based practices for transitioning. The guidance will include specifics required to meet compliance for timelines, transition steps and services, and the transition conference.	Completed Fall 2008	<i>Early On</i> Redesign Leadership Team MICC National Early Childhood Transition Center Contractors Parents Advocacy organizations
Discussion: The <i>Timely Services Reference Bulletin</i> was distributed in December 2006 and addressed the timelines associated with transitions and exceptional family circumstances. Additionally, Michigan participated in the National Early Childhood Transition Center's recent research and received feedback from that project which will be used to develop additional guidance around transition.		
Activity: The Michigan Part C data system will be upgraded to ensure timely and accurate collection of utilization and outcome data for <i>Early On</i> .	2006-2008 Ongoing	Part C Administrative Structure Michigan Part C data system contractor
Discussion: In addition to general Michigan Part C data system upgrades described under Indicator 1, updates to the data system will allow Michigan to include details of transition planning and the date of the transition conference. In addition, the system will collect data related to exceptional family circumstances. This will allow Michigan to notify service areas of findings in a more timely manner, report compliance data for all 57 service areas for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR to be submitted in February 2010, better analyze reasons for non-compliance, and provide additional data about the local early intervention programs. For the FFY 2007 APR, data for this indicator were collected through the Service Provider Self Review (SPSR). One cohort of 19 local early intervention programs completed and submitted the SPSR, including child record review results, in spring 2008. The other two cohorts completed and submitted self assessments in spring 2008. The process of upgrading the Michigan Part C data system has been time and resource consuming at the state and local levels. Adding fields to a web-based data collection system is approximately a three-year process. One year is required to program and pilot the changes. Another year is needed to train staff and provide technical assistance to get valid and reliable data. Finally, in the third year, data will be available for reporting.		
Activity: The <i>Early On</i> system will focus on strengthening partnerships between Part C and Part B personnel at the State, ISD, and LEA levels and with community partners.	Ongoing	MDE staff Head Start Local early intervention programs Michigan 4C's Other community partners
Discussion: During FFY 2006, communication was increased with ISD Special Education Directors through the use of monthly conference calls with <i>Early On</i> being one of the standing agenda items. Additionally, Part C MDE staff members attended the annual ISD Special Education Monitors meeting to share Part C developments. Finally, the Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services contracted a Part C monitoring consultant to facilitate communication between Part B and Part C at the State level. In FFY 2007, Michigan <i>Early On</i> attended multiple ISD Special Education Director meetings and developed a stakeholder group including both local <i>Early On</i> Coordinators and ISD Special Education Directors to provide insight on the local ramifications of State policy and procedure changes.		

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Activity: The <i>Early On</i> system will make available learning opportunities for families to partner in the transition process.	Ongoing	Families PTI Contractors MICC/Parent Involvement Committee NECTAC
Discussion: The CSPD, PTI, and parent support contractors will work together to provide a Parent Institute in spring 2008 that will provide an overview of the Part C system including parent rights throughout the process. Due to a low response rate, the Parent Institute did not take place.		
Activity: Develop Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for training and technical assistance, and child find and public awareness contracts.	Completed May 2007	Interagency staff
Activity: Award training and technical assistance, and child find and public awareness contracts.	Completed October 2007	MDE staff
Discussion: The RFPs for training and technical assistance, and child find and public awareness were developed and awarded in FFY 2006. The revised systems began operating October 1, 2007. The previous CSPD grantee was again awarded both the training and technical assistance and the child find and public awareness contracts.		
Activity: Analyze data measuring this indicator and develop additional improvement activities.	Ongoing with annual review through 2012	Interagency staff Part C contractors MICC Stakeholders
Discussion: As evidenced in the APR, analysis of data from multiple sources related to the SPP indicators helped Michigan identify issues within the field that need additional guidance or dialogue and plan opportunities related to the indicators and Michigan's system of general supervision in order to correct noncompliance.		
Activity: Update Michigan's Part C data system to include email notification to the LEA for local early intervention programs for children who are potentially eligible for Part B.	2009	MDE Staff Michigan Part C data system
Discussion: In FFY 2009, Michigan added a field to its data system to accurately account for timely transition planning. Training began in FFY 2009 and will continue. Beginning July 1, 2010, all local early intervention programs are required to enter these data into the data system. The FFY 2010 APR will use the Michigan data system to collect this information.		
Activity: Add component in the CIMS system to validate data entered into Michigan's Part C data system.	2010-2012	MDE Staff CIMS contractor
Discussion: Beginning in FFY 2009, CIMS added a component to allow local early intervention programs to validate data. In FFY 2009, pilot sites were chosen to complete this activity. Beginning in FFY 2010, all local early intervention programs are required to complete validation activities through CIMS.		
Activity: Update Michigan's Part C data system to allow local early intervention systems to enter exceptional family circumstances.	2010-2012	MDE Staff Michigan Part C data system
Discussion: Beginning in FFY 2009, one of the fields available in Michigan's data system was the reason for late services. Local early intervention programs are required to enter this field as of July 1, 2010.		
Activity: Update Michigan's Part C data system to allow local early intervention programs to generate reports to indicate when timelines need to be met.	2010-2012	MDE Staff Michigan Part C data system
Discussion: The Michigan Part C data system allows local early intervention programs to generate reports for a variety of activities. Local early intervention programs can create lists for timelines. This will help local early intervention programs with compliance indicators.		
Activity: Train local early intervention programs to use all components of Michigan's Part C data system.	2010-ongoing	MDE Staff Michigan Part C data system
Discussion: Training local early intervention programs on the new components of the Part C data system as well as CIMS will allow the programs to utilize the enhancements to ensure compliance.		

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan
State

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2010 (if applicable):

No revisions at this time.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See page 1 of this APR.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/General Supervision

Indicator 9: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.
Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009:

100%

INDICATOR C-9 WORKSHEET

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2008 (7/1/08 through 6/30/09)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 (7/1/08 through 6/30/09)	(b) # of Findings of non-compliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2008 (7/1/08 through 6/30/09)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 (7/1/08 through 6/30/09)	(b) # of Findings of non-compliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
home or community-based settings	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved outcomes	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2008 (7/1/08 through 6/30/09)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 (7/1/08 through 6/30/09)	(b) # of Findings of non-compliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE:	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE:	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE:	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b			0	0

Describe the Process for Selecting EIS Programs for Monitoring:

No findings were made in FFY 2008. All SPP/APR indicators that showed noncompliance were continuing noncompliance from FFY 2007. All findings made in FFY 2007 have been verified as corrected and have been reported in the FFY 2008 APR.

Local early intervention programs are selected for focused monitoring based upon their percent of compliance in each of the compliance indicators. Those local early intervention programs that are not substantially compliant in one or more compliance indicators are potential candidates for focused monitoring.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2009:

Data were gathered through local self-assessments and the Michigan Part C data system. Michigan did not have any findings through the dispute resolution process in FFY 2008. In addition, no findings were issued through the State's monitoring system.

The near maintenance in correction rate may be attributed to the State's approach to identifying findings and steps that each local early intervention program was required to complete. Each local early intervention program was required to submit, for approval, an improvement plan that detailed strategies that the local early intervention program would take to correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from notification of the finding, including verification by the State. As part of the improvement planning process, quarterly reports were submitted. Quarterly reports required the local early intervention program to conduct file reviews. When quarterly reports indicated compliance or that a State target had been met, MDE required early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency for verification of correction of noncompliance. A sample of records was sent to MDE and MDE used a checklist, based on federal regulation, to verify correction of noncompliance. Local early intervention programs are notified of the outcome of verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter. In April 2010, the CIMS-2 electronic system will direct the local early intervention program to select randomly selected files for verification.

As Michigan continues to refine its new system of general supervision, the process of identifying and notifying local early intervention programs of noncompliance and then verifying correction within one year is becoming more effective and efficient. Michigan has developed a corrective action planning system, through CIMS, which mandates that local early intervention programs develop corrective action plans for correcting noncompliance. In addition, checklists have been developed to ensure that correction of noncompliance is verified. Local early intervention programs are required to submit actual Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs) and the State verifies compliance using the checklist. A formal letter is sent to the local early intervention program verifying correction of noncompliance.

Details regarding program-specific activities related to uncorrected noncompliance are provided in the corresponding APR indicators. Michigan's current system of integrated monitoring is composed of three components: Focused Monitoring, Data Analysis, and Verification. Sites are chosen for focused monitoring based upon data and how the local early intervention program performed on compliance indicators as well as performance/results indicators. In addition, the State takes into account timely correction of noncompliance, timely data submission and accuracy of data submission. Sites are notified that they will be focused monitored by a formal letter stating which components are out of compliance. MDE staff visit each focused monitoring site for approximately three days. While there, MDE staff review records as well as meet with and ask questions of the staff and directors of the ISD. At the end of the focused monitoring visit, a preliminary report is delivered to the ISD. MDE staff write a formal report stating, when appropriate, that a corrective action plan must be completed and that correction of noncompliance must occur as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the date of notification of noncompliance, including verification. Approximately eight months after the focused monitoring visit, a focused monitoring follow-up visit occurs. At the focused monitoring follow-up visit another record review

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

is completed to verify correction of noncompliance. A formal letter is then sent to the ISD with the results of that follow-up visit.

The second component of the integrated monitoring system is data analysis. Local early intervention programs began data analysis in April 2009. Each local early intervention program receives a strand report for each compliance and results indicator. The strand report shows each local early intervention program whether it is in compliance or has reached the State target for each of the following indicators: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, and 8. When a local early intervention program is not in compliance, the CIMS-2 system will issue findings and directs the local early intervention program to specific activities that must occur. A corrective action plan for compliance indicators must be developed. Interim reports are analyzed by MDE. At the end of eight months, the State's web-based data system instructs the local intervention program to analyze randomly selected files for verification of correction of noncompliance. Local early intervention programs then mail copies of those files to MDE/Lead Agency so that staff can conduct verification utilizing a checklist. A formal letter is then sent to the local early intervention program stating the results of the verification. With results indicators, if a local early intervention program has not reached the State target, a monitoring activities report is generated. The monitoring activities report directs the local early intervention program to activities that must be completed.

The last component of the integrated monitoring system is verification. Verification takes place at any time. The State may choose local early intervention programs to verify data submission. A checklist was created and is used when actual files are sent to MDE for data verification.

Timely Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2008 (the period from July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009) (Sum of Column a on the Indicator C 9 Worksheet)	0
2. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS programs of the finding) (Sum of Column b on the Indicator C 9 Worksheet)	0
3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

4. Number of FFY 2008 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	0
6. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected

Local early intervention programs that have not verified correction of noncompliance will have sanctions enforced, which may include being focused monitored, a compliance agreement, or intensive State supervision.

Verification of Correction of FFY 2008 findings (either timely or subsequent)

As part of the corrective action planning process, local early intervention programs are required to conduct file reviews as part of the quarterly reporting process. When data from progress reports indicate correction of noncompliance has been met, MDE requires early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency for verification of correction of noncompliance. This requires the local early intervention programs to submit files to the Lead Agency which uses a checklist to verify correction of noncompliance. The checklist is based upon federal guidelines.

MDE requested that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever is greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the federal and State standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family.

Local early intervention programs are notified of the verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter closing the corrective action plan.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction in FFY 2009 of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008:

No findings were made in FFY 2008. All findings that were made in FFY 2007 were verified as corrected and reported in the FFY 2008 APR.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable)

All findings that were made in FFY 2007 were verified as corrected and reported in the FFY 2008 APR.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2006 or Earlier (if applicable)

All findings made in FFY 2006 or earlier have been verified as corrected and reported in the FFY 2008 APR.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 in accordance with IDEA section 635(a)(10)(A), 34 CFR §303.501, and OSPE Memo 09-02.</p>	<p>Michigan has verified correction of noncompliance for all local early intervention programs that were issued findings in FFY 2007. No findings were issued in FFY 2008, all noncompliance was continued noncompliance. The State reported the correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2008 APR.</p>
<p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report that it verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of</p>	<p>MDE requests that the service area identify a random representative sample of 10% of the most recent local child count or a minimum of ten records, whichever is greater, and submit them to MDE. MDE uses an indicator-specific checklist based upon the federal and State standards when reviewing each set of local program files. This ensures that the local programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. For all</p>

<p>noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>	<p>child level noncompliance and/or related requirements, citations are provided to the local program through a child level corrective action form. Local programs have 60 days to correct the noncompliance for each child record. The State verifies child level correction of noncompliance by reviewing individual child records using the same indicator-specific checklist. This review certifies that the specific missing component that caused noncompliance has been provided to that child and/or family. Verification involves review of a sample of child records according to specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1).</p> <p>Local early intervention programs are notified of the outcome of verification of correction of noncompliance through a formal letter. The collection of exceptional family circumstances helps compliance with this indicator. Another reason for the progress in this indicator is the training and technical assistance provided by the State and the training entity.</p> <p>When conducting on-site monitoring, the State issues Child Level Corrective Action Plans for all instances where the child has not received the required components. The local early intervention program has 30 days to implement the activity/activities and send to the State evidence that the activity/activities took place. In addition, in the MEGS local self-assessment the State asks for all children where the required components have not taken place, did the child receive the required activity/activities.</p>
--	---

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2009:

The overview of the development of the APR and the activities explained below describe Michigan’s current system of general supervision and the plans for improving it. Findings of noncompliance from FFY 2008 and the correction rate of those indicators are reported in this indicator.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
<p>Activity: Develop Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>MDE staff Interagency staff National Center for Special Education Accountability (NCSEAM) Monitoring Consultant Stakeholders</p>
<p>Discussion: In FFY 2007, one third of the local early intervention service programs completed the Service Provider Self Review (SPSR). The data gathered from that process identified findings of noncompliance and assisted the State in identifying systemic issues in the early intervention system. In FFY 2004 MDE staff and a group of stakeholders designed the framework for the CIMS for IDEA. In FFY 2005 and FFY 2006, staff began development of the Part C SPSR. The goal of the SPSR is to assist local early intervention programs to analyze data from multiple sources to improve outcomes for children and their families. In addition, the SPSR was used to measure compliance, inform the local and state stakeholders of the service area’s needs, and inform corrective action planning.</p> <p>The SPSR is a team process conducted by each local service area. Each local team will complete the guided process using an electronic workbook to analyze the local data on each of the eight KPIs closely aligned with the SPP indicators. Compliance and performance as an early intervention provider is examined and the results of the SPSR will direct each local corrective action plan.</p>		

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan
State

<p>In the FFY 2004 SPP, Michigan submitted a sampling plan to be used for the pilot study for early childhood outcomes. This plan divided the 57 local early intervention programs into three representative cohorts. OSEP approved this plan. Michigan has continued to use the cohorts as a device for sampling throughout the general supervision system. Each year beginning in fall 2007, one cohort will complete the SPSR on a three-year cycle.</p>		
<p>Activity: Perform focused monitoring activities for specific sites based on data.</p>	<p>Completed Ongoing</p>	<p>CIMS contractor MDE staff</p>
<p>Discussion: Originally, the Focused Monitoring process was developed to select local early intervention programs for intense monitoring around only one issue based on available data. Stakeholders concluded that for Part C, the targeted issues should include natural environments, identification, and transition. In the first two years of focused monitoring, local early intervention programs were selected based on poor performance in only one of those areas and only that area was examined closely. As OSEP has clarified the importance of compliance with SPP indicators and with further guidance from NCSEAM, Michigan has made changes to the focused monitoring process. Sites are now chosen based on compliance with timely services, timely and complete evaluations, and transition. The scope has been widened so that any noncompliance found through the process is included in the findings report. Specific details of completed focused monitoring visits can be found in the individual indicator descriptions.</p>		
<p>Activity: Train CIMS staff on Part C SPSR.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>MDE staff</p>
<p>Discussion: Training on the SPSR has been provided to MDE staff, CSPD contractor staff, and cohort 1 representatives by the CIMS contractor. The information shared at the trainings can be found at http://www.eotta.ccreesa.org/CIMS/SPSR.php.</p>		
<p>Activity: Implement SPSR for Part C.</p>	<p>Fall 2007 Completed</p>	<p>CIMS contractor</p>
<p>Discussion: As Part C staff worked with the CIMS contractor to finalize the SPSR for use with the local early intervention programs, it became apparent that it had been developed explicitly for Part B. The number of changes necessary to make it useful for <i>Early On</i> made it impossible to implement beginning in fall 2006. Therefore, the decision was made to postpone the release of the process until both the CIMS contractor and MDE staff were confident that the product was efficient and effective. The additional time allowed for the development of a project team of stakeholders from the local level that was able to review the product and provide invaluable feedback. In FFY 2007, a third of the state participated in the SPSR data collection process. Results of that process identified findings and areas where local early intervention programs need assistance. Local early intervention programs were to identify areas of needed improvement and develop a plan for those areas. Local early intervention areas identified areas of compliance as well as performance areas.</p>		
<p>Activity: The <i>Early On</i> system will monitor progress on all five Family Outcomes from the ECO Center.</p>	<p>Fall 2009</p>	<p>To be determined based on tool selected for measurement.</p>
<p>Discussion: While Michigan has adopted all five Family Outcomes as developed by the ECO Center as the goal of <i>Early On</i>, current focus is on allowing local early intervention service programs to enter data into the State's database. Work on this activity is on-going.</p>		
<p>Activity: Develop Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for training and technical assistance, and child find and public awareness contracts.</p>	<p>Completed May 2007</p>	<p>Interagency staff</p>
<p>Activity: Award training and technical assistance, and child find and public awareness contracts.</p>	<p>Completed October 2007</p>	<p>MDE staff</p>
<p>Discussion: The RFPs for training and technical assistance, and child find and public awareness were developed and awarded during the reporting period. The revised systems began October 1, 2007. The previous CSPD contractor was again awarded both the training and technical assistance and the child find and public awareness contracts with changes made based on <i>Early On</i> Redesign, funding decreases, the SPP, and system needs. In order to focus resources on those local early intervention programs most in need of assistance, a three-tiered system of training and technical assistance was developed. This allows continued generalized assistance to high performing local early intervention programs with increased training and technical assistance provided to lower performing local early intervention programs. The lowest performing local early intervention programs will receive more intense assistance from both the CSPD contractor and MDE staff.</p>		
<p>Activity: Develop RFP for Qualitative Compliance and Information Project contracts. Award the funds.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Interagency staff MDE staff</p>
<p>Discussion: The RFP for the Qualitative Compliance and Information Project (QCIP) was developed and the funds have been awarded. The revised system began October 1, 2008. The previous QCIP contractor was again awarded the contract with changes made based on <i>Early On</i> Redesign, funding decreases, the SPP, and system needs.</p>		

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan
State

Activity: Analyze data measuring this indicator and develop additional improvement activities.	Ongoing with annual review through 2012.	Interagency staff Part C contractors MICC Stakeholders
Discussion: As evidenced in the APR, analysis of data from multiple sources related to the SPP indicators helped Michigan identify issues within the field that need additional guidance or dialogue and plan opportunities related to the indicators and Michigan's system of general supervision in order to correct noncompliance.		
Activity: Implement the third component of Michigan's system of general supervision, verification, related to focused monitoring, record review, and data review findings.	Completed Ongoing	CIMS contractor MDE staff (ECE&FS and OSE/EIS)
Discussion: As Michigan's understanding of the requirements for general supervision continues to expand, MDE staff members, working with the CIMS contractor, have been able to develop a process for verifying the correction of findings of noncompliance. Because of the higher need of those local early intervention programs selected for focused monitoring, verification of those sites will be completed by an on-site visit which will consist of a record review of files and an interview with key personnel. Verification of correction of noncompliance for local early intervention programs that were not focused monitored occurs when a local early intervention program reports correction of noncompliance on a corrective action plan. The State sends out a letter asking for a sample of actual records to be sent to the State. The State then reviews the records, based on a checklist and verifies correction of noncompliance. Once verification takes place, a letter is sent to the local early intervention program either stating they corrected noncompliance or that there has not been correction of noncompliance.		
Activity: Complete the development of and streamline the entire general supervision system for <i>Early On</i> .	Spring 2008 Ongoing	NCRRC MDE staff (ECE&FS and OSE/EIS) MICC
Discussion: The lack of an effective and efficient general supervision system had a negative impact on Michigan's ability to complete the FFY 2005 APR and on Michigan's determination from OSEP. Michigan will work with the assigned NCRRC representative to examine the existing system of general supervision and to make improvements to the three basic components to allow for more timely and effective monitoring, notification of noncompliance, guidance, and verification of correction of noncompliance.		
Activity: Develop a database for tracking all segments of the general supervision system: findings, corrective action plans, quarterly reports, progress, and verification of compliance, determinations, and sanctions.	Spring 2008-2012	MDE staff CIMS contractor
Discussion: Michigan, through the Continuous Improvement Monitoring System II (CIMS-2), is currently tracking and aligning above segments of the general supervision system. A database will ensure that no pieces are lost.		
Activity: Develop a more effective and efficient system of tracking findings and correction of noncompliance.	Fall 2008-2012	CIMS contractor MDE staff (ECE&FS and OSE/EIS)
Discussion: As Michigan is tracking corrections of noncompliance, it is becoming evident that a more effective system needs to be put in place to track the timeframes of correction of noncompliance. It is becoming evident that Michigan must create a database that can track corrections of noncompliance from several years. In April 2009, Michigan began using CIMS-2. CIMS-2 allows MDE to track all findings made and progress towards compliance. CIMS-2 also notes when a finding has been verified and closed. This allows MDE to track all findings in one data system, allowing for more accurate reporting.		
Activity: Train local early intervention personnel on the new CIMS-2 process.	Spring 2008-2012	CIMS contractor MDE staff (ECE&FS and OSE/EIS)
Discussion: Michigan has made significant changes to the CIMS process. Local early intervention programs in April 2009 engaged in a process of data analysis as opposed to a self review. Findings are embedded into the CIMS-2 process. Activities and corrective action plans and/or improvement plans are required when noncompliance is found. In order for local early intervention programs to navigate through the CIMS-2 process, training is required. From October 2008 through April 2009 and ongoing, MDE has trained all local early intervention staff on the process of CIMS-2. Many meetings were held throughout the state and an online course is available. In addition, there is a helpline for any questions that come up with regard to CIMS-2.		

Optional APR Template – Part C (4)

Michigan
State

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2010 (if applicable):

No revisions at this time.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See page 1 of this APR.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/General Supervision

Indicator 10: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within the 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009:

The Part C complaints do not meet the threshold of ten for FFY 2009.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2009:

N/A

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/ Resources for FFY 2010 (if applicable):

N/A

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See page 1 of this APR.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/General Supervision

Indicator 11: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:
Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009:

No due process hearings were requested in FFY 2009.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2009:

N/A

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2010 (if applicable):

N/A

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See page 1 of this APR.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/General Supervision

Indicator 12: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B dues process procedures are adopted). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

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

FFY 2009 Measurable and Rigorous Target

Michigan Part C did not meet the threshold of ten hearing requests.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009:

No Part C hearings were requested in FFY 2009.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

N/A

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/ Resources for FFY 2010 (if applicable):

N/A

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See page 1 of this APR.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/General Supervision

Indicator 13: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

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

FFY 2009 Measurable and Rigorous Target

Michigan Part C did not meet the threshold of ten mediation requests.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009:

No Part C mediations were held in FFY 2009.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2009:

N/A

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/ Resources for FFY 2010 (if applicable):

N/A

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

See page 1 of this APR.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/General Supervision

Indicator 14: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data, State Performance Plan (SPP), and Annual Performance Reports (APR), are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, settings and November 1 for exiting, personnel, dispute resolution); and
- b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring error free, consistent, valid and reliable data, and evidence that these standards are met).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009:

The State reported data, including 618 and the SPP, were each submitted on time.

The 618 data reporting child count, including race and ethnicity, were submitted by February 1, 2009.

The exiting, personnel, and dispute resolution 618 data were reported by November 1, 2009.

Indicator 14 - SPP/APR Data			
APR Indicator	Valid and reliable	Correct calculation	Total
1	1	1	2
2	1	1	2
3	1	1	2
4	1	1	2
5	1	1	2
6	1	1	2
7	1	1	2
8A	1	1	2
8B	1	1	2
8C	1	1	2
9	1	1	2
10	1	1	2
11	1	1	2
12	1	1	2
13	1	1	2
		Subtotal	30

APR Template – Part C (4)

APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2009 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
	Grand Total – (Sum of subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	35

618 Data – Indicator 14					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Date Note Requests	Total
Table 1 – Child Count Due Date: 2/1/10	1	1	1	1	4
Table 2 – Program Settings Due Date: 2/1/10	1	1	1	1	4
Table 3 – Exiting Due Date: 11/1/10	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 4 – Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/10	1	1	1	N/A	3
				Subtotal	14
618 Score Calculation			Grand Total (subtotal x 2.5)		35

Indicator #14 Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	35.00
B. 618 Grand Total	35.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	70.00
Total N/A in APR	0.00
Total N/A in 618	0.00
Base	70.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Base*) =	1.000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.0

* Note any cell marked as N/A will decrease the denominator by 1 for APR and 2.5 for 618

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2009:

There has been discussion regarding the proposed list of changes for the data fields. Changes to the proposed data fields were initiated this program year. Additionally, the data collection contractor has also started the migration to a new web-based data system.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2010 (if applicable):

N/A