

C2	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C2	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C2 AR	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C2 AR	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Targets

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

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

XXX

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

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

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

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for A1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for A2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

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

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

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for B1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for B2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

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

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

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for C1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for C2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's part C exiting 618 data	2,311
The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.	922

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

	Yes / No
Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If the plan has changed, please provide sampling plan.	

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

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

YES

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

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

The data collected for infants and toddlers who received six (6) months or longer of early intervention services for FFY 2018 were collected using the Child Outcome Summary Form (COSF) 7-point rating scale. Nevada is reporting complete data for 2,279 of 2,311 (99%) of infants and toddlers who exited services with a program length of six (6) months or longer. Representation of progress data has increased compared to the previous years. Nevada is reporting progress data for 74 additional infants and toddlers in FFY 2018, even with the termination of an EI program in March 2018. Analysis of data for FFY 2018 indicates 32 infants and toddlers were not accounted for (based on the number of children who received six (6) months of service prior to exiting). This also leads to the demonstration of significant progress in the representation of the state's data.

Progress data for 32 children in services for six (6) months or longer was not able to be reported due to the following reasons:

- * Entry data was submitted but the EIS program reported the child did not receive intervention for the entire six (6) month timeframe due to loss of contact with families.
- * Entry data was submitted for the child; however, exit data was not submitted by the program due to a lack of internal tracking processes.
- * Exit data was submitted for the child; however, entry data had not been submitted. Therefore, progress could not be determined.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, but OSEP cannot accept those targets because the State did not indicate that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets.

3 - Required Actions

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

4 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2006	Target >=	95.00%	95.50%	96.00%	96.50%	97.00%
A	94.29%	Data	95.83%	97.20%	94.37%	98.05%	97.16%
B	2006	Target >=	94.00%	94.50%	95.00%	95.50%	96.00%
B	91.32%	Data	96.44%	93.48%	93.86%	94.81%	96.02%
C	2006	Target >=	92.00%	92.50%	93.00%	93.50%	94.00%
C	91.00%	Data	98.82%	96.90%	94.64%	97.09%	95.74%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	97.50%	97.50%
Target B >=	96.50%	96.50%
Target C >=	94.50%	94.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Clarification added 4/28/2020 for Stakeholder engagement: Stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on targets as follows:

On October 17, 2019 the IDEA Part C Office facilitated the quarterly meeting for the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC). The ICC is comprised of individuals representing the following: parent representatives who have or have recently had children enrolled in early intervention services, public and private early intervention programs, institutions of higher education, Part B 619, Inter-tribal council, Health Care Policy and Finances/Medicaid, parent

advocacy and legal advocacy groups for individuals with disabilities, military early childhood community, and the Governor's Council for Individuals with Disabilities.

Following Open Meeting Law, the agenda topic to review APR targets was scheduled prior to the 10/17/2019 meeting with the agenda provided to all members prior as well. APR targets were discussed during the meeting with stakeholders having the opportunity to comment and ask questions during the meeting, as well as following the meeting via email or phone call to the Part C Office by December 1, 2019. The ICC agreed that the targets would remain the same for the APR until the board could perform strategic planning, likely to occur over the course of 1 to 2 quarterly meetings during 2020 in order to decide the targets for the next 5 years. The next quarterly ICC meeting was held on 1/9/2020, and included the minutes from the 10/17/2019 meeting which documented the stakeholder engagement re: discussion of the targets and the board's decision to keep the targets the same; these minutes were reviewed and approved by the board on 1/9/2020.

Nevada's Family Outcomes Survey instrument was designed to meet federal requirements; however, it is also designed to provide opportunity for families to give feedback on the effectiveness of the early intervention system in responding to the needs of their family. The survey instrument was developed by a task force that included family members and representatives from the Nevada Disability Advocacy and Law Center (NDALC), Nevada Parents Educating Parents (Nevada PEP), The Nevada Center for Excellence in Disabilities (NCED), Nevada's IDEA Part C Office, NEIS programs, Early Childhood Special Education, faculty from the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR), and Mental Health Services. The original survey was developed in 2006. At the request of the IDEA Part C office and the Nevada Early Intervention Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC), revisions were made in 2008, 2009 and in 2017. A stakeholder workgroup was convened in February 2017 to begin a review and revision of the survey instrument. Technical support for the 2017 revision of the survey instrument was provided through the National Center for System Improvement (NCSI) and was implemented in March 2018 to conduct the State's 2018 Annual Family Outcomes Survey. The revised survey was changed from 20 close ended questions to 17. The same survey instrument was used for the 2018 Nevada's Family Outcomes Survey.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	1,710
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	253
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	245
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	253
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	241
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	253
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	235
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	253

	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2)	97.16%	97.50%	96.84%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2)	96.02%	96.50%	95.26%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2)	95.74%	94.50%	92.89%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for part A slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for part B slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for part C slippage, if applicable

Multiple factors affected the return rate of surveys. Although the Part C Office regularly reminds programs to ensure correct contact information for families receiving the survey invalid addresses still exist within the system. Invalid addresses in system of record (65) reduced the impact/distribution of the survey (3.7%). The Part C Office is looking to ensure a second layer of verification (within the program and at the state level) and to increase program accountability for correct contact information within the system of record. Additionally, the Part C Office will be implementing a review

process within the central office to correct invalid address returned mail in the system. One program did not have any Family Outcomes Surveys returned at all.

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

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

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

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

Due to a central office error thirty (30) surveys were returned that could not be matched back to the race ethnicity or regional data. These thirty (30) surveys represent 11.9% of the total two hundred and fifty-three (253) surveys completed and returned. There will be a change in the survey instrument for FFY 19 which will eliminate the need for unique survey codes to associate with system of record child demographic data for each returned survey. However, the Part C Office understands the risk taken regarding instances where families may decide to not include their race/ethnicity, region or program on the tool. The family outcomes survey will include a description of why and how representativeness is collected and its importance to the IDEA Part C and Early Intervention system of services. The online survey instrument will require families to include race/ethnicity and region before survey completion. The benefits and risks of having families complete an anonymous survey will be discussed in depth with the state's national technical assistance advisors. The tool for FFY19 will be uploaded with the FFY20 APR.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.

To ensure the data are representative of the demographics of the State, the IDEA Part C Office used the Tracking Resources and Children (TRAC) database to obtain the names and addresses of all families in the early intervention system who had a child with an IFSP for a minimum of six months and was receiving early intervention services from one of the state or community early intervention programs as of January 19, 2019. A total of 1,775 children met this criterion, and these families were sent a survey for each child in the home enrolled in early intervention services. On March 1, 2019, the survey was mailed to all eligible families. A cover letter accompanied each survey, as well as a postage-paid return envelope. A child specific survey code was provided to each family to ensure one survey was completed per child. The cover letter informed families their survey would be returned to the IDEA Part C Office and all responses would remain confidential. Families were also provided the option to complete their survey on-line through SurveyMonkey. If a family had provided their email address and it was entered into the TRAC data system, they were also emailed a copy of the cover letter and survey. Families were asked to answer the survey questions and return them by April 22, 2019. Local early intervention programs were notified by email of the date the surveys were mailed to families and were asked to encourage families in their program to respond to the survey.

After the initial mailing a total of 65 surveys were returned by USPS to the Part C Office because of invalid mailing addresses. The addresses used for label creation matched the addresses in the TRAC system for these families. The 65 addresses are not included in the final count because these households never received a survey. Therefore, the final total for distribution of the survey was 1,710. A follow-up reminder was sent to families who had not responded the second week of April 2019 asking them to complete the survey and offered the option to contact the IDEA Part C Office for another copy of the survey, to submit their survey via email or to complete their survey via SurveyMonkey. The final total of unduplicated survey responses was two hundred fifty-three (253). One hundred and eighty-nine (189) surveys were received by mail and sixty-four (64) responded via SurveyMonkey. This is a return rate of 14.8% which is a decrease of less than 4% from last year.

Table 1 provides a breakdown of the distribution of surveys and responses received by Race/Ethnicity per federal categories. The data compare the percentages of the statewide survey distribution and response for each race/ethnicity as well as the rate of return for each category. The percent of statewide responses were slightly higher than the percentages for distribution in the White, Asian and Two or More Races categories. The remaining categories were slightly lower in percent of responses compared to distribution percentages. It has not been determined whether the differences are statistically significant.

The percent of statewide responses received for each region was consistent with the percent distributed for each region (see Table 2). The rate of survey return by region was also relatively consistent with the statewide rate of return with the exception of the northeast region. The northeast region was much higher than the statewide response.

The southern and northwest regions were slightly lower than the statewide response. Compared to last year, these two regions report a decrease rather than increase and conversely the northeast region reports an increase rather than decrease. The regional differences of responses between where the two largest populations reside and the region where the smallest population reside could be related to the decrease of responses this year as compared to last.

The results of the FFY 2018/SFY 2019 Survey are as follows:

Know Their Rights

Statewide: This data are based on responses to Question 13 of the SFY 2019 Annual Family Survey. Families

generally agreed or strongly agreed with the three federally mandated questions on the survey. For questions related to understanding their rights under IDEA, 96.8% (245/253) of the families responding to the 2019 survey agreed with the statement, My IFSP team helps me know my parent rights regarding early intervention services (the procedural safeguards that are in the parent handbook). Performance did not meet the State's target of 97.5% for this reporting period and remains consistent compared to the 2018 survey. There were 5 families indicating they were undecided regarding this question.

Effectively Communicate Their Children's Needs

Statewide: This data are based on responses to Question 6 of the SFY 2019 Annual Family Survey regarding the impact of participating in early intervention services on helping them to support their child's development, 95.2% (241/253) of responses were favorable for the statement: "The early intervention services we received have helped me effectively communicate my child's needs." Performance for this statement did not meet the state target of 96.5% and is lower by 1% compared to the 2018 survey. A total of 6 families indicated they were undecided regarding this question.

Help Their Children Develop and Learn

Statewide: These data are based on responses to Question 14 of the SFY 2019 Annual Family Survey which states, "My Early Intervention providers have supported me in knowing how to help my child develop and learn", 92.8% (235/253) responded favorably. Performance for this statement did not meet the State target of 94.5% and is considerably lower than the 96% reported on the same question in the 2018 survey.

The rate of survey return by region was relatively consistent with the statewide rate of return with the exception of the northeast region was much higher than the statewide response. The southern and northwest regions were slightly lower than the statewide response. Compared to last year, these two regions report a decrease rather than increase and conversely the northeast reports an increase rather than decrease. The differences could be related to the lack of responses this year as compared to last.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2018 response data are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the population.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

4 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, but OSEP cannot accept those targets because the State did not indicate that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets.

4 - Required Actions

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	0.47%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	0.95%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%
Data	0.80%	1.12%	1.24%	1.11%	1.13%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	1.00%	1.08%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Clarification added 4/28/2020 for Stakeholder engagement: Stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on targets as follows:

On October 17, 2019 the IDEA Part C Office facilitated the quarterly meeting for the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC). The ICC is comprised of individuals representing the following: parent representatives who have or have recently had children enrolled in early intervention services, public and private early intervention programs, institutions of higher education, Part B 619, Inter-tribal council, Health Care Policy and Finances/Medicaid, parent advocacy and legal advocacy groups for individuals with disabilities, military early childhood community, and the Governor's Council for Individuals with Disabilities.

Following Open Meeting Law, the agenda topic to review APR targets was scheduled prior to the 10/17/2019 meeting with the agenda provided to all members prior as well. APR targets were discussed during the meeting with stakeholders having the opportunity to comment and ask questions during the meeting, as well as following the meeting via email or phone call to the Part C Office by December 1, 2019. The ICC agreed that the targets would remain the same for the APR until the board could perform strategic planning, likely to occur over the course of 1 to 2 quarterly meetings during 2020 in order to decide the targets for the next 5 years. The next quarterly ICC meeting was held on 1/9/2020, and included the minutes from the 10/17/2019 meeting which documented the stakeholder engagement re: discussion of the targets and the board's decision to keep the targets the same; these minutes were reviewed and approved by the board on 1/9/2020.

Nevada has met the target for this indicator every year.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	387
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/20/2019	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	35,781

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
387	35,781	1.13%	1.00%	1.08%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Compare your results to the national data

Data for this indicator are gathered through the Tracking Resources and Children (TRAC) statewide data system and include all children with an active Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) on December 1, 2018. This is a point-in-time count.

Nevada count of children served, ages birth to one (1) year for this reporting period was 387 which is twenty-five less than the 412 reported for December 1, 2017. This represents 1.08% of the general population of infants in the State.

Nevada's performance is slightly below the national percent of 1.25% and ranked 32nd in percent of population served when compared to the U.S. and outlying areas. Although this indicator does not meet the criteria for slippage, the Part C Staff are continuing to implement strategies to ensure that state and local referral sources are aware of how to access and refer infants for whom there is a developmental concern.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The ICC Child Find Subcommittee has recently begun utilizing the Child Find Self-Assessment (CFSA) developed by OSEP, ECTA and DaSY to strengthen our efforts in reaching all of the eligible children across the state of Nevada.
Prior FFY Required Actions

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

5 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, but OSEP cannot accept that target because the State did not indicate that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Baseline	2005	1.36%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Data	2.38%	2.78%	2.99%	2.98%	2.95%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	2.00%	2.46%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Clarification added 4/28/2020 for Stakeholder engagement: Stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on targets as follows:

On October 17, 2019 the IDEA Part C Office facilitated the quarterly meeting for the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC). The ICC is comprised of individuals representing the following: parent representatives who have or have recently had children enrolled in early intervention services, public and private early intervention programs, institutions of higher education, Part B 619, Inter-tribal council, Health Care Policy and Finances/Medicaid, parent advocacy and legal advocacy groups for individuals with disabilities, military early childhood community, and the Governor's Council for Individuals with Disabilities.

Following Open Meeting Law, the agenda topic to review APR targets was scheduled prior to the 10/17/2019 meeting with the agenda provided to all members prior as well. APR targets were discussed during the meeting with stakeholders having the opportunity to comment and ask questions during the meeting, as well as following the meeting via email or phone call to the Part C Office by December 1, 2019. The ICC agreed that the targets would remain the same for the APR until the board could perform strategic planning, likely to occur over the course of 1 to 2 quarterly meetings during 2020 in order to decide the targets for the next 5 years. The next quarterly ICC meeting was held on 1/9/2020, and included the minutes from the 10/17/2019 meeting which documented the stakeholder engagement re: discussion of the targets and the board's decision to keep the targets the same; these minutes were reviewed and approved by the board on 1/9/2020.

Nevada has met the target for this indicator every year.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	3,265
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/20/2019	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	110,055

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
3,265	110,055	2.95%	2.00%	2.97%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Compare your results to the national data

The percent of the overall birth through age three general population receiving early intervention services in Nevada, based on the December 1, 2018 Child Count, is below the national average of 3.48% as published in the 2018 Part C Child Count and Settings (Table 4) rankings dated November 1, 2019. Nevada ranked 35th when compared to the U.S. and outlying areas. There are few states with comparable birth to three population (18-19 child count). Nevada's Birth to 3 population was 110,055. States with similar population numbers for birth to three range between 0.85% to 4.94%. Connecticut 4.94%, Kansas 4.75%, Mississippi 1.95%, Arkansas 0.85%, each of these states has a reported birth to 3 population within 3,000 of Nevada's. The US and Outlying territories averaged 3.48%. Nevada's FFY 2018 data are within 0.51% of the national average.

Data for this indicator are gathered through the Tracking Resources and Children (TRAC) statewide data system and include all children with an active Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) in December 1, 2018. This is a point-in-time count.

Nevada's number of children served, ages birth through 2 years for this reporting period was 3,265 which is 9 less than the 3,274 reported for December 1, 2017. This represents 2.97% of the projected general population of infants in the State.

Cumulative data for this reporting period show a total of 6,509 children, ages birth through two, were served over the course of the reporting period. There was a decline of 314 less children served in early intervention during this FFY.

Although this indicator does not meet the criteria for slippage, the Part C Staff are continuing to implement strategies to ensure that state and local referral sources are aware of how to access and refer infants and toddlers for whom there is a developmental concern.

The Part C office is overwriting the U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates with the 2018-19 Child Count and Settings spreadsheet provided on the GRADS site.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The targets established for this Indicator through FFY 2018 were presented to State ICC for review and comment during this reporting year. No changes were proposed; therefore, the targets are maintained at the level previously established. Given the state's performance history, it is felt by the stakeholders that the targets are appropriate.

The ICC Child Find Subcommittee meets quarterly and is comprised of stakeholders from the State of Nevada higher education system, NV Department of Education representation, State of Nevada early intervention/early childhood community partner representatives, the Nevada Parents Encouraging Parents (PEP) organization, and other ICC members.

The ICC Child Find Subcommittee has recently begun utilizing the Child Find Self-Assessment (CFSA) developed by OSEP, ECTA and DaSY to strengthen our efforts in reaching all eligible children across the state of Nevada.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

6 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, but OSEP cannot accept that target because the State did not indicate that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	67.10%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.83%	99.83%	99.38%	99.88%	99.76%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2,222	2,486	99.76%	100%	99.44%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

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

250

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

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

The Part C Office audits the TRAC data collection system quarterly for this data. The annual monitoring uses the first three quarters of data for all early intervention programs in this indicator. The fourth quarter of data are audited for verification of correction. These data are reflective of all children entering the early intervention programs from referral to the development of the initial IFSP. The performance data for this indicator are taken from the Tracking Resources and Children (TRAC) data collection system. All early intervention services (EIS) providers in the State are required to maintain individual child data in the TRAC system for all children enrolled in their programs. The data for this report is based on the final data for the FFY 2018 reporting period. The reporting period for the collection of data are July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.

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

These data include all eligible infants and toddlers with an Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) for whom initial evaluation/assessment and initial IFSP meetings were conducted from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019 and are therefore representative of the total population served. The performance data for this indicator are taken from the Tracking Resources and Children (TRAC) data system. All early intervention service (EIS) providers in the State are required to maintain individual child data in the TRAC system for all children enrolled in their programs. The data for this report are based on the final data for the FFY 2018 reporting period.

The data show:

A total of 2,486 children required an initial evaluation/assessment and an initial IFSP meeting convened during the reporting period.

There were 2,472 children who had their initial IFSP meeting conducted within 45 days from the date they were referred to the early intervention system. This number includes the 250 children whose development of the initial IFSP was delayed due to family circumstances. The remaining fourteen (14) children had an initial IFSP meeting convened beyond the 45-day timeline but the delay was verified to be due to program circumstances. Therefore, 2,472 of all 2,486 (99.44%) initial IFSPs were compliant with the 45-day timeline requirement.

Family circumstances documented as reasons for delay in meeting the 45-day timeline for convening the initial IFSP included:

Family cancellation of appointments

Child hospitalized or ill

Parent not available to schedule the appointment within the 45-day timeline (work schedule, vacation, relocating, etc.)

Parent had personal or medical emergency and was not available for appointments

Monitoring EIS Provider Programs for Compliance with 45-Day Requirements

A total of twelve (12) EIS provider agencies were active in the State during this reporting period. Monitoring of these programs for this indicator was conducted through a desk audit of data from the TRAC system. The Part C Data Manager generates reports for each provider agency on a quarterly basis and each program is required to complete any needed data clean-up at this time. Due to the IDEA Part C Office annual monitoring schedule, compiled data for the first three (3) quarters of the fiscal year are utilized for annual program monitoring purposes. Each program's performance/compliance status is based on the compiled data for the first three (3) quarters of the fiscal year. A finding of noncompliance was issued to any program whose performance was less than 100%. A second verification of the agency's data accuracy is conducted through a random review of child records for the programs included in the comprehensive monitoring process for the reporting period. For agencies that have a finding of noncompliance for this Indicator based on data for the first three quarters, the agency's TRAC data for the fourth quarter of the year is utilized to verify correction of the noncompliance if performance is at 100%.

Results of FFY 2018 Monitoring

Twelve (12) EIS programs were monitored through the TRAC data system for compliance with 45-day timeline requirements in FFY 2018. Five (5) EIS programs were found to be at 100% compliance.

Six (6) EIS programs were issued a new finding of noncompliance for this indicator based on data for the first three quarters of the reporting period. All six (6) programs had performance of 95% or above, which is considered substantially compliant. One (1) EIS program had a new finding, however, the program had their contract canceled.

Timely correction of system issues could not be verified for this program as the result of the termination of the program's contract. Subsequent to this program's closure, the Part C Office identified that all children with noncompliance in this indicator had exited early intervention services, therefore, no further verification is required, consistent with OSEP memo 09-02. The five (5) remaining programs have been verified to have timely correction based on performance of 100% in the fourth quarter of the reporting year.

Clarification added 4/28/2020: Fourth Quarter Data

While this information is not required to be provided in this year's APR, the NV IDEA Part C Office is separating the following information as a tickler for the development of next year's APR: We issued 5 letters of correction. The 6th program was the program which was mentioned to have been terminated. Correction could not be verified because their service agreement was terminated on 9/8/2019, less than 3 months from the issuance of the finding and prior to the finalization of our 4th quarter data. The five (5) remaining programs have been verified to have timely correction based on performance of 100% in the fourth quarter of the reporting year.

While the State did not meet the target of 100% for FFY 2018, all EIS provider agencies were found to be substantially compliant and all programs have been verified as corrected.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

One (1) program had 122 of 127 (96%) child records that met the 45-day timeline, however, this program's contract has been terminated and the program is no longer providing early intervention services.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	2	1	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

A total of twelve (12) EIS provider agencies were active in the State during this reporting period. Monitoring of these programs for this indicator was conducted through desk audit of data from the TRAC data system. The Part C TRAC Manager generates reports for each provider agency on a quarterly basis and each program is required to complete any needed data clean-up at this time. Due to the IDEA Part C Office annual monitoring schedule, compiled data for the first three (3) quarters of the fiscal year are utilized for annual program monitoring purposes. Each program's performance/compliance status is based on the compiled data for the first three (3) quarters of the fiscal year. A finding of noncompliance was issued to any program whose performance was less than 100%. New data reports for this indicator are generated on a quarterly basis from the TRAC data system. New data reports generated in quarters subsequent to the issuing of the finding are reviewed. When a program was found to be at 100% for one (1) quarter based on the new data, the program demonstrated it is implementing the requirements of this indicator for all children enrolled, and the program was provided written notification of correction of the identified noncompliance. Agencies are required to review their tracking processes for the eligibility timeline to identify the underlying causes leading to non-compliance and to ensure compliance with the 45-day timeline. For agencies that have a finding of noncompliance for this indicator based on data for the first three quarters, the agency's TRAC data for the fourth quarter of the year is utilized to verify correction of the noncompliance once performance is at 100%.

Clarification added 4/28/2020:

When noncompliance is found, a finding is issued and that is the data we provide to programs in their June 30th response letter. Sometimes, the process occurs very quickly, and correction can occur by the 4th quarter. Programs have a year to correct noncompliance but 4th quarter data is not required to be reported for the correction until next year. The NV IDEA Part C Office provides this information as a tickler for developing next year's APR.

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

A second verification of the agency's data are conducted through a TRAC desk audit of child records for all programs with a finding in this indicator for the reporting period in order to verify each individual child correction.

Clarification added 4/28/2020: The NV IDEA Part C Office verified that each EIS program with noncompliance is (1) correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring and/or desk audit; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance. Upon issuing a finding, the NV IDEA Part C team conducts follow-up monitoring and collection of data to ensure that the requirements are being met. For indicator 7, we used our database for this process. As mentioned above, when a program was found to be at 100% for one (1) quarter based on the new data, the program demonstrated it is implementing the requirements of this indicator for all children enrolled, and the program was provided written notification of correction to reflect resolution or close out of the identified noncompliance.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

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

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

7 - OSEP Response

OSEP cannot determine if the FFY 2018 data for this indicator are valid and reliable based on the State's description of how it is collecting its monitoring data. Specifically, the State reported that "the annual monitoring uses the first three quarters of data for all early intervention programs in this indicator. The fourth quarter of data are audited for verification of correction." Therefore, it is unclear what data the State is using to report under this indicator.

The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019). The State did not, as required by the Part C Indicator Measurement Table, describe how the time period in which the data were collected accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

The State did not demonstrate that the EIS program or provider corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	85.71%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.92%	99.49%	94.85%	95.10%	97.98%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

If no, please explain.

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
81	83	97.98%	100%	97.59%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

0

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

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

In FFY 2018, the Part C Office completed comprehensive on-site monitoring of six (6) EIS programs relative to this indicator. The monitoring process is to complete a review of half of the programs in each year. The number of children enrolled in each program was taken into consideration to ensure an equitable breakdown of the number of children served statewide, so the data are representative of all children across the state for each year of the cycle. The timeframe covered for the FFY 2018 monitoring covered the period of July 1, 2018 and March 31, 2019 and the data included all activity during that period for the children reviewed. A minimum number of records were required to be reviewed by the IDEA Part C Office, which included: 10% of enrollment for large programs (300 or more active children) and 20% for smaller programs (fewer than 300 active children). There were no late transition plans due to exceptional family circumstances in the selection of records reviewed in FFY 2018. The number of records reviewed is sufficient to ensure the data was representative of the statewide enrollment and accurately reflected the programs performance relative to all children served by the program.

Four (4) of the six (6) programs monitored for this indicator were found to be compliant for including timely and comprehensive plans in each child's IFSP. Two (2) programs were found to have noncompliance as follows:

One (1) program had a compliance performance of 17 of 18 (94%) records compliant in FFY 2018. The Part C Office verified correction on October 22, 2019.

One (1) program had a compliance performance of 90% (9 of 10). Correction for this program will be reported in FFY 2019.

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

XXX

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

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The timeframe covered for the FFY 2018 monitoring covered the period of July 1, 2018 and March 31, 2019. Verification of correction is done using the fourth quarter data.

Data for this indicator are taken from Program monitoring for the first three quarters of the reporting period (July 1, 2018 – March 30, 2019). There were 81 of 83 (98%) applicable child records reviewed to evaluate the timeliness and completeness of transition plans included in the child's IFSP that met the requirements of this indicator. Because the data are gathered through monitoring for this indicator, there is a difference between the total number of children exiting Part C services in the State during the fiscal year and the number of children for whom data are reflected for Indicator 8.A.

Clarification added 4/28/2020:

When noncompliance is found, a finding is issued and that is the data we provide to programs in their June 30th response letter. Sometimes, the

process occurs very quickly, and correction can occur by the 4th quarter. Programs have a year to correct noncompliance but 4th quarter data is not required to be reported for the correction until next year. The NV IDEA Part C Office provides this information as a tickler for developing next year's APR.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Clarification added 4/28/2020: The NV IDEA Part C Office verified that each EIS program with noncompliance is (1) correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring and/or desk audit; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance. Upon issuing a finding, the NV IDEA Part C team conducts follow-up monitoring and collection of data to ensure that the requirements are being met. For indicator 8A, we used desk audit for this process. As mentioned above, when a program was found to be at 100% for one (1) quarter based on the new data, the program demonstrated it is implementing the requirements of this indicator for all children enrolled, and the program was provided written notification of correction to reflect resolution or close out of the identified noncompliance. One (1) program had a compliance performance of 17 of 18 (94%) records compliant in FFY 2018. The Part C Office verified correction on October 22, 2019. One (1) program had a compliance performance of 90% (9 of 10). Correction for this program will be reported in FFY 2019 as the program is still in their year of correction and have until June 28, 2020 to correct. A new set of records will need to be reviewed and verified onsite or through desk audit.

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

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

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

8A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8A - OSEP Response

OSEP cannot determine if the FFY 2018 data for this indicator is valid and reliable based on the State's description of how is collecting its monitoring data. Specifically, the State reported that "the annual monitoring uses the first three quarters of data for all early intervention programs in this indicator. The fourth quarter of data are audited for verification of correction." Therefore, it is unclear what data the State is using to report under this indicator.

The State did not demonstrate that the EIS program or provider corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider.

8A - Required Actions

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8B - Indicator Data

Historical Data

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

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

YES

If no, please explain.

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1,274	1,274	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of parents who opted out

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

0

Describe the method used to collect these data

Nevada does not have an opt-out policy for notifications to the State Education Agency (SEA) and the Local Education Agency (LEA).

The compliance percentage for this indicator was derived using the Tracking Resources and Children (TRAC) child data collection system. In completing the 618 Exit Data Report, Nevada used the categories under Program Completion for FFY 2018 (2018-2019) to calculate the number of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B. Nevada has defined "potentially eligible for Part B" as all Part C eligible children since Nevada has a restrictive eligibility definition. The IDEA Part C Office issued monthly notifications to the pertinent LEA and to the SEA. The process is verified at multiple levels to ensure appropriate notification has been sent for all children. For this reporting period, there were 1,274 children who were potentially eligible for Part B services. Appropriate notification was issued for all (100%) of these children. Children who were referred less than 45 days prior to their third (3rd) birthday are not included in this calculation.

School districts where there were no children potentially eligible received notifications that stated there were no children in their district who were potentially eligible for Part B during the reporting period.

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

NO

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

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

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

Data for this indicator represent all children exiting IDEA Part C services in Nevada and potentially eligible for Part B services from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019.

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

Notification is sent to the LEA and the SEA for all children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B during the reporting period. This data are sent to both the SEA and the LEA on a monthly basis. The State of Nevada verifies monthly the number of Part B potentially eligible children exiting Part C against the notifications sent to LEAs and SEAs for all children.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

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

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

8B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8B - OSEP Response

8B - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role

Designated Lead Agency Director

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

Name:

Lori Ann Malina-Lovell, DrPH

Title:

Clinical Program Planner I / Part C Coordinator

Email:

lamalinalovell@dhhs.nv.gov

Phone:

(702) 486-3012

Submitted on:

04/28/20 10:58:37 PM