

# ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR NORTH CAROLINA 2007

Deborah Carroll, Ph. D., Early Intervention Branch Head  
Department of Health and Human Services  
Division of Public Health  
Women's and Children's Health Section  
Early Intervention Branch  
1916 Mail Service Center  
Raleigh, NC 27699-1916  
(919) 707-5520

In this Annual Performance Report (APR), North Carolina's Early Intervention Program will describe specifics on progress and slippage on all required indicators previously described in the State Performance Plan (SPP).

North Carolina's early intervention program is organizationally located in the North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services, in the Division of Public Health. Within the Women's and Children's Health Section of the Division of Public Health, the Early Intervention Branch manages the program on a statewide level, and its eighteen (18) employed and contracted Children's Developmental Services Agencies (CDSAs) manage the program on a local level.

The North Carolina Early Intervention Program will describe the state's continued approach to its general supervision system, as well as statewide efforts that will continue to improve results for eligible infants, toddlers and their families. The program has continued to face challenges in meeting its child find targets and will outline a data driven plan to revise the state's targets to better reflect our local realities.

The North Carolina Early Intervention Program continues to work with several different stakeholder groups throughout the year, as was done with the SPP, for this year's APR. These stakeholder groups include the North Carolina Interagency Coordinating Council, the Division of Public Health Women's and Children's Health Section Family Advisory Council, and the Commission for Children with Special Health Care Needs.

When the APR is approved by OSEP, the North Carolina Early Intervention Program will disseminate the report to stakeholders through the local lead agencies and post it on the program's website. The State Performance Plan will be updated to include the enclosed Indicator 3 as well as revised improvement activities. Program specific data (with the exception of Indicators 4) are included in the APR; therefore once posted the state will meet the requirements of public reporting of data. Program specific data is not included in Indicator 4 due to small numbers for which data were not statistically relevant to disaggregate by each local program.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007 – 2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

**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 USC 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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 – 2008	100%

**Actual Target Data for 2007 – 2008: 93% compliance**

CDSA	2007-2008
Asheville	100%
Blue Ridge	100%
Charlotte*	98%
Concord	100%
Durham†	90%
Elizabeth City	100%
Fayetteville^	93%
Greensboro†	86%
Greenville†	87%
Morganton^	84%
New Bern^	94%
Raleigh^	93%
Rocky Mount*	97%
Sandhills^	79%
Shelby*	98%
Smokies	100%
Wilmington^	79%
Winston-Salem*	97%
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>93%</b>

Compliance by the Children’s Developmental Services Agencies (CDSAs) in meeting the timely services compliance indicator was determined via a record review of all children who had services added to their IFSP in January 2008. Seven hundred ten (710) records of children were reviewed for timeliness of initial and ongoing service provision. Ninety-three percent (n=659) of children received their services in a timely manner or, the delay in the initiation of services was due to documented family circumstances. Seven percent (n=51) of children did not receive all their services in a timely manner due to CDSA specific delays. There were some isolated unique instances with documented reasons for delays.

Record review data indicate five (5) CDSAs that achieved 100% compliance (including documented family circumstances). Four (4) CDSAs (denoted in chart with \*) had noncompliance due to unique isolated incidents. It was found that these instances were isolated (e.g. a provider having a family emergency on start date of service) and did not occur on a routine basis. Six (6) CDSAs (denoted in chart with ^) have been issued a finding and received a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) due to systemic noncompliance. At the time of monitoring, the remaining three (3) CDSAs (denoted in chart with †) were still under a CAP issued in FY2006-2007. All three have since corrected noncompliance within one year.

**Discussion of Completed Improvement Activities and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007 – 2008:**

The progress from 92% (FY 2006-2007) to 93% (FY 2007-2008) is expected to continue. This progress can be attributed to the following improvement activities: additional direct service staff hired at the local CDSAs to provide services when a community provider is not available, and planned and focused technical assistance with each CDSA. Challenges have continued in providing services in a timely manner due to the lack of appropriately qualified community-based providers, particularly in very rural areas of the State.

For FY2007-2008, the detailed analysis of the number of services delayed is shown below:

Number of Children	Total Number of Services Per Child’s IFSP	Number of Services Delayed
7	1	1
13	2	1
17	3	1
8	3	2
3	4	1
1	5	1
1	5	3
1	5	4

When analyzing the frequency of delayed early intervention services, speech (47%), physical therapy (14%) and special instruction (30%) are the most commonly delayed services. The other 9% are a variety of services. When there are no appropriately qualified community-based providers, the CDSA staff must provide the service themselves. We expect that this challenge will continue, and the exploration of new service delivery models is necessary in order to improve and have greater access to community-based providers. Some evidence based service delivery models we plan to explore include primary coaching, transdisciplinary process and consultative approaches.

The North Carolina Early Intervention Program has put a system in place to identify and correct noncompliance in a timely manner and is also addressing how to sustain correction of noncompliance across the state. The State has received technical assistance (**see Addendum A**) to address this area of noncompliance and propose new improvement activities (see below).

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007 – 2008:**

The State will receive technical assistance through the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC) and Mid-South Regional Resource Center (Mid-South) to integrate and implement new service delivery models into the program’s existing service delivery system.

OUTCOME: Improve access to appropriately qualified community based providers

IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES	TIMELINE	RESOURCES
<p><b>1. Review of current service delivery system</b></p> <p>a. review current policies and procedures to examine any barriers to accessing providers</p>	<p>December 2008- June 2009 (for a, b, and c)</p>	<p>(for a, b, and c)</p> <p>Mid-South, NECTAC</p> <p>OSEP</p> <p>Stakeholders (internal &amp; external)</p>

<p><b>1. Review of current service delivery system (continued)</b></p> <p>b. review current roles/responsibilities of CDSA staff</p> <p>c. assess reimbursement system</p>		
<p><b>2. Exploration of new service delivery models</b></p> <p>a. receive technical assistance on a variety of approaches that can enhance the state’s current service delivery system</p> <p>b. develop a workplan that outlines activities, timelines and resources to implement any new models</p>	<p>November 2008-June 2009</p>	<p>Mid-South</p> <p>NECTAC</p> <p>Other Part C Programs</p> <p>Stakeholders (internal &amp; external)</p>
<p><b>3. Implementation of new service delivery models</b></p>	<p>July 2009-June 2010</p>	<p>Mid-South</p> <p>NECTAC</p> <p>NC Division of Medical Assistance and other Third Party Payors</p> <p>Stakeholders (internal &amp; external)</p>

This plan will address assessing the state’s current reimbursement systems to support new service delivery models, strategic training and technical assistance for the community, families and providers as well as reviewing program policies and procedures. In 2008-2009, the program will concentrate on reviewing existing policies and procedures, involve stakeholders in short and long range decisions and create a systematic workplan to implement new service delivery models.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007 – 2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

**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 programs for typically developing children.

**Measurement:**

Percent = # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children divided by the total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 – 2008	96.5%

**Actual target data for 2007-2008: 98.9%**

CDSA	Dec 1, 2007 Head Count	Number of children receiving services at home or other natural environment	% children receiving services at home or other natural environment
Asheville	314	313	99.7%
Blue Ridge	213	212	99.5%
Charlotte	808	808	100.0%
Concord	574	572	99.7%
Durham	538	534	99.3%
Elizabeth City	189	189	100.0%
Fayetteville	555	547	98.6%
Greensboro	652	621	95.2%
Greenville	471	468	99.4%
Morganton	273	271	99.3%
New Bern	305	305	100.0%
Raleigh	905	899	99.3%
Rocky Mount	466	461	98.9%
Sandhills	440	432	98.2%
Shelby	421	410	97.4%
Smokies	211	207	98.1%
Wilmington	319	314	98.4%
Winston-Salem	583	580	99.5%
North Carolina	8237	8143	98.9%

**Discussion of Completed Improvement Activities and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007 – 2008:**

The data from FY 2007-2008 documents that the target was met and exceeded (by 2.4%) for this indicator in North Carolina. The State is continuing to monitor local programs to ensure that IFSP teams are making service setting decisions on an individualized basis and in compliance.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007 – 2008:**

None

**Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

**Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments**

**Indicator 3:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrated 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:

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

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

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

By the end of June 2007, North Carolina's Early Intervention Program completed the process of phasing in all CDSAs for reporting on the child outcomes indicator. By November 2007, all 18 CDSAs were in the routine cycle of reporting entry and exit data to the EI Branch Central Office. North Carolina is using the ECO Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF) as our child outcomes measurement tool. With all CDSAs now actively collecting child outcomes data, we have provided a brief comparison of the baseline data presented for the 2006-2007 reporting period, with limited CDSAs reporting, and the 2007-2008 data, with all CDSAs reporting. We will continue to collect this data for all CDSAs to inform our local process of child outcomes target setting, due for reporting in the FY 2010 Annual Performance Report.

Specifically, every child enrolled in Early Intervention for a minimum of six months receives an entry and subsequent exit measurement of their developmental status when compared with same-aged peers.<sup>1</sup> The three areas of development are positive social-emotional skills, acquiring and using knowledge, and

<sup>1</sup>Note: Because NC uses the ECO COSF measurement tool, "compared with same-aged peers" refers to the assignment of a score of 6 (*Child's functioning generally is considered appropriate for his or her age but there are some significant concerns about the child's functioning in this outcome area. These concerns may be substantial enough to suggest monitoring or possible additional support.*) or 7 (*Child shows functioning expected for his or her age in all or almost all everyday situations that are part of the child's life. Functioning is considered appropriate for his or her age.*) on the rating scale to measure developmental status.

taking appropriate action to meet needs. The measurement of these behaviors and skills is completed by reviewing all available information compiled through developmental evaluation, observation, input of caregivers, and interviews with parents of the child.

Our process in NC is embedded in the on-going delivery of Early Intervention Services as outlined in the child’s IFSP. The initial rating in each area is assigned as the child enters services when the IFSP is signed. An exit rating is determined no more than thirty days prior to the child’s third birthday and transition from early intervention services. Prior to July 2008, CDSAs were also required to submit annual ratings, given at the annual IFSP review. However as this additional data measurement point was not a federal requirement, the EI Branch Central Office in discussion with CDSA management, chose to discontinue this practice.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2007 (2006-2007) and FFY 2008 (2007-2008) Data (Excluding At-Risk Children):**

Outcome Area	FY 2006-2007		FY 2007-2008	
	Number of children	% of children	Number of children	% of children
A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):				
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	5	2%	30	1%
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	49	16%	480	22%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	51	16%	448	20%
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	91	29%	645	29%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	115	37%	612	28%
Total	N = 311	100%	N = 2218	100%

Outcome Area	FY 2006-2007		FY 2007-2008	
	Number of children	% of children	Number of children	% of children
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication):				
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	3	1%	18	1%
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	58	19%	500	23%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did	67	22%	624	28%

# SPP Template – Part C (3)

North Carolina  
State

not reach				
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	126	41%	831	37%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	57	18%	245	11%
Total	N = 311	100%	N = 2218	100%

Outcome Area	FY 2006-2007		FY 2007-2008	
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number of children	% of children	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	4	1%	22	1%
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	56	18%	482	22%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	54	17%	499	23%
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	126	41%	875	39%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	71	23%	340	15%
Total	N = 311	100%	N = 2218	100%

During FY2007-2008, an additional ten (10) children exited whose eligibility was determined to be in the At-Risk category. As this number is so small, detailed data is suppressed, as it may identify individual children. North Carolina's eligibility criteria changed on July 1, 2006 to no longer include at risk children.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2010	Targets will be set in 2010.

### Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

As of July 2008, the EI Branch Central Office has been in the process of recruiting staff for existing vacancies within the Quality Improvement Unit. Upon completion of this recruitment exercise, we will engage in intensive training activities which will include collaboration with ECO staff to receive technical assistance on monitoring COSF tool usage by CDSAs. We will also work with staff funded through the GSEG grant to learn of ways to better understand CDSA needs and desires regarding improved child outcomes and usage of the rating system. Through these efforts, we anticipate developing recommended best practices for ensuring reliability and consistency of reporting across CDSAs. We have also pledged to support the ECO bid for a federal research grant to test the viability of the COSF instrument as a tool

for child outcome measurement. We believe this step is essential to ensuring the validity and the reliability of our measurement system.

As the child outcomes target is not to be reported until the FFY 2010 APR, North Carolina will continue to monitor the reporting of child outcomes data while providing ongoing technical assistance to CDSAs as appropriate. From our tracking system, we will continue to report child outcomes data for APR 2009 and 2010. At this time, we should have a greater appreciation of the efficiency of the COSF tool as a measurement instrument as well as being more fully equipped to provide the technical assistance that CDSAs need for the accuracy and reliability in our figures. During this same period, we will be aggressively researching national child outcomes data to learn of those best practices that are most effective in achieving improved child outcomes. We will then work to tailor our program to improve efficiency in these key strategy areas with the hope that it will improve overall child outcomes, thus achieving our performance targets. With approximately four years of preliminary data available, FFY 2007 through FFY 2010, we should have very realistic targets set for North Carolina's children with equally viable strategies identified to improve child outcomes from FFY 2010 onward.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007 – 2008**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

**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.

**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.

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Measurable and Rigorous Target</b>
<b>2006 (2006-2007)</b>	<b>See Table On Next Page</b>
<b>2007 (2007-2008)</b>	<b>See Table On Next Page</b>
<b>2008 (2008-2009)</b>	<b>See Table On Next Page</b>
<b>2009 (2009-2010)</b>	<b>See Table On Next Page</b>
<b>2010 (2010-2011)</b>	<b>See Table On Next Page</b>

# APR Template – Part C (4)

North Carolina  
State

Indicator	Proposed Goals					Actual Results	
						Actual Results	
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family to:						NCSEAM Survey	NCSEAM Survey
a) know their rights	<u>2006-07</u> 89%	2007-08 90%	2008-09 90%	2009-10 90%	2010-11 90%	<u>2006-07</u> 70%	<u>2007-08</u> 69%
b) effectively communicate their children's needs; and	<u>2006-07</u> 83%	2007-08 84%	2008-09 85%	2009-10 86%	2010-11 86%	<u>2006-07</u> 69%	<u>2007-08</u> 67%
c) help their children develop and learn	<u>2006-07</u> 89%	2007-08 90%	2008-09 91%	2009-10 91%	2010-11 91%	<u>2006-07</u> 80%	<u>2007-08</u> 78%

### Actual Target Data for 2007-2008:

For 2007–2008, all families of children receiving services under the early intervention program in North Carolina who exited the early intervention program were mailed the *NCSEAM Family Survey – Early Intervention*. The *NCSEAM Family Survey* is designed to yield reliable, valid, and useful measures of families' perceptions and involvement in early intervention. It is specifically intended to measure the outcome areas required by OSEP. For assistance in distributing surveys and analyzing results of returned surveys, we contracted with Avatar International LLC.

Each survey mailed contained a cover letter and a postage-paid envelope for returning the completed survey. A total of 3592 surveys were mailed by Avatar International using a client address file provided by the North Carolina EI Branch Central Office.

**Survey Results**

The *NCSEAM Family Survey – Early Intervention* (North Carolina version) includes one demographic item (child’s age at the time he/she was referred for early intervention services) and 47 rating scale items divided into two groups: “Family-Centered Services” and “Impact of Early Intervention Services on Your Family.”

Of the 3592 surveys mailed, 769 were returned, 759 with measurable data needed for reporting the SPP/APR indicators 4a, 4b, and 4c. The effective response rate was 21%. Of the total EI census of 8,237 families, the 759 figure represents approximately 9.2% of families. Individual survey items’ overall agreement percentages are then associated with a 6.1% margin of error, at a 95% confidence level for an item with a 50-50 agree-disagree rate. The data meet or exceed the NCSEAM 2005 National Item Validation Study’s standards for the internal consistency, completeness, and overall quality expected from this survey.

**Survey Data by Race/Ethnicity (*OSEP Categories*)**

Data	Source	N	American Indian	Asian/Pacific Island	Black	Hispanic	White	Other
EI Census	12/1/07 data	<b>8237</b>	<b>1%</b> (128)	<b>2%</b> (130)	<b>26%</b> (2149)	<b>16%</b> (1327)	<b>55%</b> (4503)	
Target Group	Total surveys distributed	<b>3592</b>	<b>1%</b> (51)	<b>1%</b> (51)	<b>25%</b> (906 )	<b>14%</b> (504 )	<b>56%</b> (1998)	<b>2%</b> (82)
Respondent Pool	Total surveys returned	<b>769</b>	<b>&lt;1%</b> (6)	<b>2%</b> (13)	<b>18%</b> (139)	<b>9%</b> (69)	<b>69%</b> (531)	<b>1%</b> (11)

Avatar International LLC has advised against making adjustments to the “respondent pool” to more closely match the race/ethnicity demographics of the “target group” of all families who received the survey. Our method of distributing the *NCSEAM Family Survey* to every family whose child exits the program provides equal opportunity for every family in the target group to complete the survey. Avatar’s experience with other states in similar survey analysis has proven that such adjustments do not significantly alter the results.

# APR Template – Part C (4)

North Carolina  
State

The following table provides a summary of North Carolina’s proposed target goals and actual survey results for 2007-2008.

Indicator	2007-2008 NCSEAM Survey	Target Goals 2007-2008	Actual Results 2007-2008
4: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family to:	NCSEAM Family Survey – Early Intervention		
a) know their rights;	<p>a) 69%= 538 of 769 families Over the past year, Early Intervention services have helped me and/or my family know about my child’s and family’s rights concerning Early Intervention services.</p> <p>[Total responses = 769]</p>	a) 90%	a) 69%
b) effectively communicate their children’s needs; and	<p>b) 66%= 523 of 769 families Over the past year, Early Intervention services have helped me and/or my family communicate more effectively with the people who work with my child and family.</p> <p>[Total responses = 769]</p>	b) 84%	b) 67%
c) help their children develop and learn	<p>c) 78%= 608 of 769 families Over the past year, Early Intervention services have helped me and/or my family understand my child’s special needs.</p> <p>[Total responses = 769]</p>	c) 90%	c) 78%

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-2008:

As indicated in the FFY 2006 APR, service coordinators informed families about the nature and importance of the surveys as well as ensured that families received surveys in their primary language. If the family needed the survey presented verbally, interpreted, or presented via another mode of communication, the service coordinator was responsible for securing this assistance.

Training and technical assistance by EI Branch Central Office staff to support the collection, reporting and use of family outcome data occurred in early spring 2008. Multiple modalities (face-to-face sessions and



conference calls) were used for CDSA administrators and service coordinators. This training and technical assistance described the purpose of the data collection and the importance of supporting families in completing the survey. Sample scripts for use in contacting families were provided.

Data entry and analysis continued through a contract with Avatar International LLC. We received detailed reports from Avatar twice a year to validate the numbers of parents returning surveys, the rating for each of the three family outcomes and demographics regarding the families completing the surveys. The number and demographics of families responding was compared to the total number and demographics of children who transitioned from the program during the same period of time and the December 1, 2007 headcount demographics. This comparison ensured appropriate implementation and application of the data collection requirement. The Quality Improvement Unit of the Early Intervention Branch Central Office provided CDSAs who had low numbers of responses to the survey with additional technical assistance and support to address any identified areas of need.

FFY 2006-2007 was the first year North Carolina used the NCSEAM Family Survey – Early Intervention. Comparison of that first year's use of the NCSEAM survey with FFY 2007-2008 showed essentially no change in the return rate of surveys or in the ratings given by families. This information was presented to the Child and Family Outcomes Subcommittee of the North Carolina Interagency Coordinating Council which serves as the primary stakeholder group for our State Performance Plan. Based upon recommendations of that stakeholder group and our experience across two years of survey distribution, the following improvement activities are proposed for FFY 2008-2009.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007 – 2008**

- 1) In FFY 2008-09, NC will change its survey distribution timeframe to include all enrolled families (as of December 1, 2008) who have been receiving services at least six months prior to the survey. We believe this will increase family participation in completing surveys because families will be actively receiving services at the time of the survey (versus receiving the survey after exiting the program).
- 2) In FFY 2008-09, NC plans to continue to contract with Avatar International LLC to mail surveys to enrolled families and receive completed surveys by return mail. In addition, NC will utilize service coordinators to hand-deliver written announcements to families to alert them to the survey's arrival date. Contract providers of services will also be asked to hand-deliver announcements to families during regular service delivery contacts. This method will not require additional contacts as all families will be actively receiving services. Other community agencies will be made aware of the survey distribution date and requested to encourage and support families in completing the survey.
- 3) In FFY 2008-09, NC will continue to focus on increasing the return rate of surveys (see strategies 1 & 2 above). Follow-up will be made with family groups with a history of low survey return rate (primarily Black and Hispanic families) to offer support in completing/returning the survey.

In addition, all CDSAs will receive a program-specific report on the survey results for FFY 2006-2007 and 07-08. Technical assistance will be provided to each CDSA on how to use the results in 1) staff training on family-centered service delivery, 2) updating local policies and procedures related to working with families, and 3) involving families in local evaluation efforts.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007 – 2008**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/ Child Find**

**Indicator 5:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to:

- A. Other states with similar eligibility definitions; and,
- B. National data.

**Measurement:**

- A. Percent = # of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs divided by the population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 times 100 compared to the same percent calculated for other states with similar moderate eligibility definitions.
- B. Percent = # of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs divided by the population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 times 100 compared to national data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>2007 – 2008</i>	<i>1.10%</i>

Actual Target Data for 2007 – 2008: 0.89%

CDSA	Children Aged Birth (0) to 1 Year	Population Aged Birth (0) to 1 Year	Percent of Population Aged Birth (0) to 1 Year
Asheville	51	4,120	1.24%
Blue Ridge	36	1,921	1.87%
Charlotte	130	13,978	0.93%
Concord	82	10,119	0.81%
Durham	48	8,668	0.55%
Elizabeth City	21	2,434	0.86%
Fayetteville	79	7,942	0.99%
Greensboro	92	10,186	0.90%
Greenville	64	4,913	1.30%
Morganton	30	4,425	0.68%
New Bern	47	6,315	0.74%
Raleigh	123	13,183	0.93%
Rocky Mount	65	5,898	1.10%
Sandhills	59	5,703	1.03%
Shelby	68	5,333	1.28%
Smokies	33	1,927	1.71%
Wilmington	55	5,543	0.99%
Winston-Salem	83	8,682	0.96%
North Carolina (state demographer data)	1166	121,290	0.96%
North Carolina (US Census Bureau data)		131,293	0.89%
National			1.05%

This table provides the birth (0) to 1 year of age data for the eighteen CDSAs. The table also shows the statewide and national percentage of children enrolled in early intervention services as compared to the same-age population. North Carolina is in the ‘moderate’ category for determining eligibility for children enrolled in early intervention services and ranks tenth (10<sup>th</sup>) among the fourteen (14) states in this category.

We have included the data for North Carolina as reported by the NC state demographer as well as the data from the US Census Bureau for comparative purposes. The difference in population numbers creates a difference in the percentages. The North Carolina state demographer data is also included, as it is the population used in North Carolina public health publications.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-2008:**

North Carolina’s current data shows an increase in both the percentage and number of children ages birth to 1 year enrolled in and served by the EI program from FY 2006-2007 (0.90% or 1057 children) to FY 2007-2008 (0.96% or 1166 children).<sup>2</sup> . It is noteworthy that children receiving early intervention services on military bases are counted in NC’s total population of birth to 1 year old children, but these children are not actually served by the state’s program. There were a total of 16 children birth to 1 that were enrolled in military early intervention programs (rather than the state program) based upon the December 1 Headcount. These children’s services are provided by the federal government through the military’s health infrastructure.

The progress made thus far may be attributed to the focused monitoring process implemented for FY 2007-2008. In fall 2007, three on-site focused monitoring visits occurred that addressed child find (birth to 1 year). Quality improvement Central Office staff identified common trends in each CDSA and provided technical assistance in improving (or increasing) the numbers of children birth to 1 year enrolled in early

<sup>2</sup> Percentages are based on North Carolina State Demographer population estimates.

intervention services. Although the proposed target has not been achieved, progress has occurred and improvement activities are being implemented.

Improvement activities: In reference to the improvement activities identified over the past two years, monthly headcount data was shared and continues to be shared with each CDSA identifying each program’s percentages enrollment on the first day of each month, related to the number of children aged birth to one in the population. Quality Improvement staff shared results from each of the three focusing monitoring visits to support each CDSA in examining practices and procedures related to child find, whether they had been successful in reaching the state’s target or not. As a result, some CDSAs made changes that improved their Child Find statistics. Strategies identified on improvement plans from the three programs that participated in the focus monitoring visits were shared across the state. Individual CDSAs used the focus monitoring concepts to determine how to improve child find activities within their programs. Other units within the Early intervention Branch Central Office began activities to enhance public awareness as well as identify strategies to improve communication with referral sources.

A group of participants involved in the focused monitoring visits met in Spring of 2008 to discuss suggestions and recommendations and to review practices other states have used to improve child find activities. The group met again in the Fall of 2008 with additional stakeholders to discuss the current targets and future targets for child find. The group recommended a revision of program targets for this indicator. Justification for this decision is provided below.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-2008:**

(A) Stakeholders (State ICC, parents, other interagency partners, and CDSA staff) met on November 25, 2008 to review and discuss our current targets for birth to 1 child find activities in comparison to our actual figures. Currently, our targets and actual figures are as follows:

	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
<b>Target</b>	SPP baseline	1.00	1.00	1.10	1.20	1.30	1.35
<b>Actual</b>	0.78	0.97	0.84	0.89	NA	NA	NA

In light of our continuing challenges in meeting these targets, the group felt that the NC Early Intervention Program should take a multi-pronged view of target-setting by:

1. Reviewing targets set by states with similar eligibility definitions and populations served.
2. Reviewing simulated projections of the birth to 1 population served through 2010, using historical trends.
3. Reviewing evidence-based research to determine whether the enrollment age of children is a fairer and more accurate assessment of the actual birth to 1 population served as opposed to the current analysis of the Dec. 1 headcount.

A further explanation regarding each of these issues is provided below.

**Review of Other States**

We reviewed the trends of Illinois, New York and Indiana. They all have a moderate eligibility definition and use similar strategies to NC in their child find activities. We learned that all three of these States were having challenges in meeting the targets that they had set initially in their respective SPPs. Indiana was the only State which made a decision to change its targets to more accurately represent its program capabilities.

**Eligibility**

The North Carolina Early Intervention Program’s eligibility criterion was changed effective July 1, 2006. This eligibility change removed two high risk categories of eligibility: high risk potential and atypical development. These children have been exiting the program as they aged out or made progress and no longer needed services. This eligibility definition revision has changed the category in which North Carolina is ranked as compared to other states.

**Review of Simulated Projections**

We conducted simulated projections of our growth rate in serving children birth to 1 using current trends in the population of children served. We determined that the assumption made in the SPP of a continuous growth rate beyond 2007 did not occur.

**Reviewing Evidence-based Research**

A September 2004 article published in Snapshots titled “Method for Counting the Number of Children Served in the IDEA Part C Early Intervention Program May Be Underestimating State Efforts,”<sup>3</sup> has proven to be very insightful regarding our local realities. Following the methodology in this research paper, one CDSA conducted an analysis using local data and determined that the birth to 1 population served was significantly underestimated when using the Dec. 1 headcount figures instead of the child’s enrollment age. The child’s age at enrollment is a more appropriate measure of the effectiveness of birth to 1 child find activities than the Dec. 1 headcount because the headcount represents a snapshot in time. We believe that a more conservative estimate of future targets is warranted by our program because of the significant discrepancy between the Dec. 1 headcount and enrollment figures. We will examine this concept using data from additional CDSAs.

**Recommendation**

We believe the following projections to be more appropriate with our program capabilities, yet still rigorous:

	2004- 2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
<b>Target</b>	baseline	1.00	1.00	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10
<b>Actual</b>	0.78	0.97	0.84	0.89	--	--	

We will make the appropriate changes to our State’s SPP targets once approved through the APR process. At this writing, we are holding the targets to the same level, as we will need to get additional stakeholder input after reviewing the data on this indicator for 2008-2009.

The focused monitoring stakeholder group as well as the ICC will continue to meet to examine the state’s progress in meeting this performance target as well as determine the effectiveness of improvement strategies.

(B) All improvement activities in the 2008 APR will continue with the addition of a self-assessment toolkit which provides a framework and process for CDSA staff to:

- Examine aspects of their day-to-day operations related to child find and the referral/intake process
- Identify program strengths related to child find

<sup>3</sup> Dunst, C.J., Fromewick, J., & Hamby, D.W. (2004). Method for Counting the Number of Children Served in the IDEA Part C Early Intervention Program May Be Underestimating State Efforts. *Snapshots, I(3)*. Available from <http://www.tracecenter.info/products.php>.

- Clarify areas in which improvement is desired
- Develop a plan to enhance specific CDSA practices related to child find and referral/intake process
- Ensure the program's practices are responsive to families' need

Quality Improvement Central Office staff will be working with CDSAs to use the toolkit and statewide data will be collected on results.

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/ Child Find**

**Indicator 6:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to:

- A. Other states with similar eligibility definitions; and,
- B. National data.

**Measurement:**

- A. Percent = # of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs divided by the population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 times 100 compared to the same percent calculated for other states with similar moderate eligibility definitions.
- B. Percent = # of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs divided by the population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 times 100 compared to national data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 – 2008	1.95%

**Actual Target Data for 2007 – 2008: 2.12%**

The North Carolina Early Intervention program exceeded its target of 1.95%. Whereas Indicator 5 (birth to 1) targets are being revised due to various factors noted above, no revision is planned for Indicator 6 (birth to 3). The enrollment of children in the program has continued to increase; the issue is that not all children who enroll are found as early as possible.

CDSA	Children Aged Birth (0) to 3 Year	Population Aged Birth (0) to 3 Year	Percent of Population Aged Birth (0) to 3 Year
Asheville	314	12,584	2.50%
Blue Ridge	213	5,876	3.62%
Charlotte	808	41,556	1.94%
Concord	574	30,331	1.89%
Durham	538	26,262	2.05%
Elizabeth City	189	7,344	2.57%
Fayetteville	555	23,802	2.33%
Greensboro	652	31,265	2.09%
Greenville	471	15,035	3.13%
Morganton	273	13,744	1.99%
New Bern	305	17,986	1.70%
Raleigh	905	39,056	2.32%
Rocky Mount	466	18,089	2.58%
Sandhills	440	17,062	2.58%
Shelby	421	16,256	2.59%
Smokies	211	5,885	3.59%
Wilmington	319	16,473	1.94%
Winston-Salem	583	26,212	2.22%
North Carolina (state demographer data)	8237	364,818	2.26%
North Carolina (US Census Bureau data)		389,042	2.12%
National			2.53%

This table provides the birth (0 years) to 3 year of age data for the eighteen CDSAs. The table also shows statewide totals and the national percentage of children enrolled in early intervention services as compared to the same-age population. North Carolina is in the 'moderate' category for determining eligibility for children enrolled in early intervention services and ranks tenth (10<sup>th</sup>) among the fourteen (14) states in this category.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-2008:**

North Carolina’s current data indicate continued increases in both the percentage and number of children ages birth to 3 years enrolled in and served by the EI program from FY 2006-2007 (2.13% or 7500 children) to FY 2007-2008 (2.26% or 8237 children).<sup>4</sup> The population in North Carolina and the number of children served by the Early Intervention Program has continued to grow. As noted above, children receiving early intervention services on military bases are counted in NC’s total population of birth to 3 year old children, but these children are not actually served by the state’s program. There were 109 children ages birth to 3 on the December 1 Headcount for the two military installations in North Carolina. Their services are provided by the federal government through the military’s health infrastructure.

Efforts to show more successful child find activities over the past two years have included revisiting intake processes at CDSAs to more quickly respond to families whose children were referred to the program, as well as outreach and public awareness from individual programs about early intervention to referral sources. Programs were provided monthly headcount data based upon the number of children enrolled in the program on the first day of each calendar month. CDSAs used strategies from focused-monitoring visits to increase child find activities. Most CDSAs continued to show improvements above the state

<sup>4</sup> Percentages are based on North Carolina State Demographer population estimates.



## APR Template – Part C (4)

North Carolina  
State

target in this indicator, and CDSAs who needed additional technical assistance were provided that support.

In 2008, approximately 300 Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) members representing NC's 100 counties attended one of six regional trainings sponsored by the LICC Subcommittee of the state ICC. Each training discussed the role of LICCs as key partners within NC's early intervention system. The trainings also and introduced participants to newly-developed child find and transition reporting tools.

The child find tool provided LICCs a way to document their local efforts and share their activities with other LICCs. It also provided a means to portray the state's overall efforts targeting identified referral sources.

With 70 LICCS reporting, preliminary results show that more than half of the LICCs were found to provide targeted outreach efforts to the more "traditional" referral sources such as: Parents/Caregivers, Physicians/Medical Community, Department of Social Services, Local Public Health Department, Hospitals, child care resource, and referrals agencies or family resource centers. Conversely, the newer populations identified in the recent IDEA reauthorization (domestic violence, homeless, low literacy groups) are less recognized by LICC as potential community referral sources (see chart below).

Primary Referral Source	Percentage of LICCs Targeting Referral Source
Parent/Family Caregiver	67%
Physicians & Medical Community	61%
Department of Social Services	56%
Public Health Department	53%
Hospital(s)	46%
Other: Family Resource Center	41%
Child Care Programs	39%
Child Care Resource & Referral Agency	37%
Partnerships for Children/ Smart Start	36%
Early Head Start & Head Start	30%
Mental Health Agency/Provider	29%
Domestic Violence Shelters & Agencies	21%
Homeless Family Shelters	11%
Even Start	6%

Planned 2009 LICC trainings include a focus on strategies to identify service duplication or gaps, and develop targeted efforts that maximize resources.

### Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007 - 2008:

None

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007 – 2008**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

**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 USC 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:**

Percent = # of eligible 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 # of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 – 2008	100%

**Actual Target Data for 2007-2008: 96%**

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-2008.**

The methodology for data collection changed in 2007-2008 from a child record review analysis to a data inquiry process. During the FY 2007-2008 the EI Branch Central Office provided each CDSA with a list of children (extracted from the state’s database) who did not receive an IFSP within 45 days of referral. The data included all children enrolled during the months of October, November and December 2007. Through this process, data on 1,860 children was examined to verify the 45-day timeline for compliance. Overall, the North Carolina Early Intervention Program reported 96% compliance for the FY 2007-2008. This figure represents slippage of 2.9% from the FY 2006-2007 compliance figure of 98.9%.

In 2006-2007, the program achieved 98.9% compliance. Record review data indicate that eighteen (18) CDSAs achieved compliance (including documented family circumstances). Of the 18 CDSAs, 3 CDSAs had only one instance of not meeting the 45-day timeline. An example was the difficulty in locating a Russian interpreter. The CDSA has reported that a consistent Russian Interpreter resource has since been identified. After review of the documentation and interviews with staff, it was found that the instance in each of these CDSAs was isolated and did not occur on a routine basis. The other two instances were related to emergency personnel issues. Local programs had implemented policies and procedures to address these instances and provided relevant data to document correction of noncompliance in a timely manner. Therefore, there were no findings issued.

## APR Template – Part C (4)

North Carolina  
State

In 2007-2008, of the 1860 children, seventy-six percent (n=1413) of children received an IFSP within 45 days of referral. Twenty percent (n=374) showed delays due to documented family circumstances. Where relevant, each program submitted reasons why any child did not receive an IFSP within 45 days. The table below displays the results of the data inquiry with the analysis as follows:

April – June 2008 CDSA	Compliance
Asheville	97%
Blue Ridge	100%
Charlotte	99%
Concord	99%
Durham	98%
Elizabeth City	100%
Fayetteville	94%
Greensboro	86%
Greenville	97%
Morganton	98%
New Bern	81%
Raleigh	99%
Rocky Mount	100%
Sandhills	98%
Shelby	99%
Smokies	90%
Wilmington	96%
Winston-Salem	100%

Data verification indicated that four (4) CDSAs achieved 100% compliance (including documented family circumstances). Following documentation review and interviews with staff, eleven (11) CDSAs reported isolated instances that did not occur on a routine basis; therefore, there were no findings issued for these programs. Three (3) programs were cited a finding and placed on a corrective action plan to be completed within one year of notification of the finding. Current documentation indicates that two CDSAs have made progress and one CDSA has already corrected noncompliance. Slippage (3.2%) was attributed to personnel and procedural changes for these three CDSAs in the State.

Due to past noncompliance with the 45-day timeline, North Carolina has focused its implementation activities on making changes in the intake process and assigning Early Intervention Service Coordinators in a timely manner. These changes have decreased potential delays in initiating eligibility evaluations for children. In addition, programs streamlined their evaluation processes to include what is necessary to determine eligibility and still complete a quality evaluation. Quality Improvement Central Office staff provided focused technical assistance to all CDSAs to support examination of causes for delay and the implementation of efficient strategies. Effective strategies for CDSAs in corrective action plans were shared with all other programs to serve as preventative ways that CDSAs could maintain compliance.

### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007 – 2008:**

## APR Template – Part C (4)

North Carolina  
State

None. Compliance with this indicator is currently at the 96% level, and ongoing monitoring and technical assistance are occurring per the State Performance Plan. This ongoing monitoring and technical assistance efforts focus on quickly identifying and remedying any noncompliance.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007 – 2008**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition**

**Indicator 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
- B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B: and
- C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.

(20 USC 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:**

- A. Percent = # of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services divided by # of children exiting Part C times 100.
- B. Percent = # of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred divided by the # of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B times 100.
- C. 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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 – 2008	100%

**Actual Target Data for 2007-2008:**

- A. Service Plan Includes Transition Steps and Services: 96%**
- B. Notification to the Local Education Agency (LEA): 98%**
- C. Transition Planning Conference: 96%**

**A. Service Plan Includes Transition Steps and Services:**

<b>CDSA</b>	<b>2007-2008</b>
Asheville	100%
Blue Ridge	97%
Charlotte	90%
Concord	100%
Durham	96%
Elizabeth City	100%
Fayetteville	100%
Greensboro	97%
Greenville*	68%
Morganton	92%
New Bern	84%
Raleigh	99%
Rocky Mount	100%
Sandhills	100%
Shelby	91%
Smokies	100%
Wilmington	98%
Winston-Salem	100%
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>96%</b>

Table A: This table denotes 96% (n=1172) compliance in FY 2007-2008 for children who are transitioning and have IFSPs with transition steps and services. There was slippage of 3.26% (99.26%) from FY 2006-2007.

In 2007-2008, there were 1,226 records reviewed during October, November and December 2007 to examine whether IFSPs had transition plans with steps and services. Eight (8) of eighteen CDSAs achieved 100% compliance. Following documentation review and interviews with staff, 9 (nine) of eighteen CDSAs reported unique, isolated instances. These instances were related to documentation issues and were corrected in a timely manner. Therefore no findings of noncompliance were issued. One CDSA was cited with a finding and has been issued a corrective action plan to be completed within one year from written notification.

In FY 2006-2007, there were two instances of noncompliance. After interviews with staff, it was found that these were unique, isolated incidences and the specific situations did not occur on a regular basis. Correction of noncompliance was made in a timely manner and no findings were issued.

**B. Notification to the Local Education Agency (LEA):**

<b>CDSA</b>	<b>2007-2008</b>
Asheville	100%
Blue Ridge	100%
Charlotte	100%
Concord	100%
Durham	86%
Elizabeth City	100%
Fayetteville	100%
Greensboro	94%
Greenville	97%
Morganton	100%
New Bern	98%
Raleigh	100%
Rocky Mount	97%
Sandhills	100%
Shelby	96%
Smokies	100%
Wilmington	100%
Winston-Salem	98%
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>98%</b>

Table B: This table denotes an improvement in notification of the LEA of a child potentially eligible for Part B from 96% in FY 2006-2007 to 98 % (n=1183) in FY 2007-2008.

In FY 2007-2008, there were 1,208 records reviewed to examine whether the LEA was appropriately notified of potentially eligible children, representing a significant increase from the 249 records reviewed in FY 2006-2007. Eleven (11) of eighteen CDSAs reported 100% compliance. Following documentation reviews and interviews with staff, seven (7) of eighteen CDSAs reported unique isolated instances. These instances were corrected in a timely manner and local LEAs were notified of children.

In FY 2006-2007, there were unique isolated instances of noncompliance and correction was made in a timely manner. These instances were determined to be related to individual Early Intervention Service Coordinators.

**C. Timely Transition Planning Conference**

(Data are for the time period of October-December 2007):

CDSA	2007-2008
Asheville	95%
Blue Ridge	100%
Charlotte	95%
Concord	98%
Durham	94%
Elizabeth City	100%
Fayetteville	98%
Greensboro	93%
Greenville	95%
Morganton	86%
New Bern	89%
Raleigh	99%
Rocky Mount	100%
Sandhills	95%
Shelby	91%
Smokies	94%
Wilmington	95%
Winston-Salem	99%
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>96%</b>

Table C: The data represents 96% compliance for FY 2007-2008 which is slippage of 3.2% in compliance as compared to FY 2006-2007 data of 99.2%

In 2007-2008, 1,208 records were reviewed to examine the percentage of children potentially eligible for Part B and whether a timely transition planning conference was held no later than 90 days before the child’s third birthday. Seventy-seven percent (n= 931) of records denoted that a conference was held in a timely manner. Nineteen percent (n= 227) were not held in a timely manner due to documented family circumstances or late referral to Part C. Three (3) CDSAs reported 100% compliance (including documented family circumstances). Twelve (12) CDSAs reported after documentation review and interviews with staff that there were unique isolated instances of noncompliance. Policies and procedures were developed to address these instances of noncompliance. Relevant data has been provided which ensured correction of noncompliance in a timely manner. Therefore, no findings were issued. Three (3) CDSAs were cited a finding and corrective action plans were issued. Compliance is to be corrected within one year from the written notification.

In FY 2006-2007, there were two isolated instances of noncompliance. Through interviewing staff and reviewing documentation in the record, these instances did not occur on

a routine basis. No findings were issued. Follow-up by state staff on the implementation of policies and procedures that were implemented ensured that correction of noncompliance was made in a timely manner.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in 2007-2008.**

See above descriptions with each chart.

Due to past noncompliance in meeting the timely transition planning conference indicator, the North Carolina Early Intervention program focused its improvement activities on revising the general supervision monitoring system. The purpose was to become more effective in identifying and correcting noncompliance and ensuring system wide improvement. Strategies included a variety of activities including partnering with the Part B 619 program to help ensure children experience a smooth transition



from Part C to Part B. A practice document, “Guiding Practices in Transition” is under development for both Part B and Part C personnel.

Over a time span through June 2007 all programs corrected noncompliance related to this compliance indicator so the Annual Performance Plan of 2006-2007 showed 99.26% compliance. Although this was not at 100% compliance, noncompliance was related to unique isolated instances and there were no findings reported in the APR. In this current APR, slippage of 3.26% was noted in Indicator 8a (development of a transition plan and steps). Slippage was attributed to personnel and procedural changes at the local level. This was addressed in the corrective action plans and progress has been noted. Slippage of 3.2% was noted in indicator 8c (timely transition planning conference). Slippage was attributed to inappropriate scheduling of meetings and lack of planning ahead for meetings. Strategies to address these areas were identified in the corrective action plans and progress has already occurred.

In 2008, approximately 300 Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) members representing NC’s 100 counties attended one of six regional trainings sponsored by the LICC Subcommittee of the state ICC. Each training discussed the role of LICCs as key partners within North Carolina’s Early intervention system. The trainings also introduced participants to newly-developed child find and transition reporting tools.

### **The transition reporting tool captured the frequency of six listed transition activities:**

- 1. Discussion(s) about specific local procedures for transition between Infant Toddler or Preschool/Exceptional Children early intervention programs as indicated by state level interagency agreement**
- 2. Assist in the development or dissemination of a list of community resources and contacts for children who may not qualify for early intervention services**
- 3. Provide information on local orientation program for new professionals with information on early intervention community programs, contacts, referral procedures, and transition practices.**
- 4. Provide information on local orientation program for new professionals with information on early intervention community programs, contacts, referral procedures, and transition practices.**
- 5. Provide information on local community forum(s) that address community transition issues and procedures between programs.**
- 6. Review written program information for families on the transition process and provide input to the Infant Toddler or Preschool/Exceptional Children early intervention programs (s).**

### **These activities target the following five programs or entities where children with or at risk for developmental disabilities may transition:**

- 1. Child Service Coordination**
- 2. Child Care Programs**
- 3. Head Start/Early Head Start**
- 4. More At Four,**
- 5. Home care**

The reporting tool also documented the number of events/activities conducted by LICC partners.

Preliminary findings indicate that the most common transition activities focused on:

- making the five community programs/entities aware of the purpose and content of the statewide interagency agreement

- distributing information materials about supplemental community services to children either referred and not eligible or currently enrolled in Part C and Part B programs are the next most common transition activities
- periodically reviewing transition materials among community programs and families to ensure that the information remains up-to-date and family friendly

The 2009 LICC trainings will focus on strategies to identify service duplication or gaps and develop targeted efforts that maximize resources.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities /Timelines/Resources for 2007-2008:**

None. Compliance with this indicator's elements are currently at the 96% level or higher and ongoing monitoring and technical assistance are occurring per the State Performance Plan. This ongoing monitoring and technical assistance efforts focus on quickly identifying and remedying any noncompliance.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

**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.

**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.

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 – 2008	100%

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued findings in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance 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	6	6	6
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0		
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0		
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0		

**APR Template – Part C (4)**

North Carolina  
State

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued findings in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
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		
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	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		
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	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		
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	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		
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	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:	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0		
A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	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:	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0		
B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0		

# APR Template – Part C (4)

North Carolina  
State

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued findings in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
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:	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0		
C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0		
<b>Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b</b>			6	6
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification= Note: [column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum] times 100			<b>100%</b>	

NOTE: to maintain the self-calculating feature of the worksheet, highlight both rows (Monitoring Activities & Dispute Resolution) across all columns, right click and choose insert.

No other findings were issued as related to any other IDEA requirements

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007 – 2008:

A short description of progress or slippage by indicator is as follows:

Indicator 1-North Carolina has historically had challenges providing services to children in a timely manner. As noted in the tables below, many CDSAs were issued new findings each year. Based upon information that the program subsequently received from OSEP (clarification of definition of finding), these programs actually had one finding, instead of multiple findings, that continued across several fiscal years as noted with the asterisk (\*). The Early Intervention Branch Central Office initiated rigorous activities as mentioned in Indicator 1 to address this systemic noncompliance by adding 197 positions to the early intervention system. These positions began being filled October 1, 2006. The state initially took a systemic approach in correcting this noncompliance in order to address the greatest need at the time: staff to provide the needed services.

After these efforts, six (6) CDSAs continued to exhibit noncompliance in 2006-2007. The Early Intervention Branch Central Office issued a finding of noncompliance and a corrective action plan with specific steps and strategies to address the noncompliance. Intensive monthly progress reporting to the EI Branch Central Office occurred as well as focused technical assistance by the program's Quality Improvement Central Office staff. These staff members conducted on-site visits to collect and validate data as well as ensure progress was being made. These six (6) CDSAs corrected noncompliance within one year as planned. In 2007-2008, six (6) different CDSAs were issued a finding of noncompliance.

The North Carolina Early Intervention Program has put a system in place to identify and correct in a timely manner any noncompliance and also how to address sustaining correction of noncompliance across the state. Corrective action has occurred and written verification of correction within one year was sent to inform the CDSAs that noncompliance has been corrected. The State has received technical assistance (see Addendum A) to address this area of noncompliance and integrate and implement new service delivery models into the program's current service delivery system. This plan

## APR Template – Part C (4)

North Carolina  
State

will address assessing reimbursement systems to support new service delivery models, strategic training and technical assistance for the community, families and providers and review of the program policies and procedures.

Indicator 1: Tables analyzing correction of noncompliance from FY 2004- 2005 through 2006-2007:

FY 2004-2005	Finding	Corrected within one year	Corrected after one year
Asheville	Y	N	Y
Blue Ridge	Y	N	Y
Charlotte	Y	Y	
Concord	Y	N	Y
Durham	Y	N	Y
Elizabeth City	N	n/a	
Fayetteville	Y	N	Y
Greensboro	Y	N	Y
Greenville	Y	N	Y
Morganton	Y	N	Y
New Bern	Y	N	Y
Raleigh	Y	N	Y
Rocky Mount	Y	Y	
Sandhills	Y	N	Y
Shelby	N	n/a	
Smokies	Y	Y	
Wilmington	Y	N	Y
Winston-Salem	Y	Y	

# APR Template – Part C (4)

FY 2005-2006	Finding	Corrected within one year	Corrected after one year
Asheville*	Y	N	Y
Blue Ridge*	Y	Y	
Charlotte	Y	N	Y
Concord*	Y	N	Y
Durham*	Y	N	Y
Elizabeth City	Y	Y	
Fayetteville*	Y	Y	
Greensboro*	Y	N	Y
Greenville*	Y	N	Y
Morganton*	Y	Y	
New Bern*	Y	Y	
Raleigh*	Y	Y	
Rocky Mount	N	n/a	
Sandhills*	Y	Y	
Shelby	N	n/a	
Smokies	N	n/a	
Wilmington*	Y	Y	
Winston-Salem	N	n/a	Y

\*Continued noncompliance from previous year.

FY 2006-2007	Finding	Corrected within one year
Asheville*	Y	Y
Blue Ridge	N	n/a
Charlotte*	Y	Y
Concord*	Y	Y
Durham*	Y	Y
Elizabeth City	N	n/a
Fayetteville	N	n/a
Greensboro*	Y	Y
Greenville*	Y	Y
Morganton	N	n/a
New Bern	N	n/a
Raleigh	N	n/a
Rocky Mount	N	n/a
Sandhills	N	n/a
Shelby	N	n/a
Smokies	N	n/a
Wilmington	N	n/a
Winston-Salem	N	n/a

\*Continued noncompliance from previous year.

- Indicator 2- Target met.
- Indicator 3- Targets to be established in 2010.

- Indicator 4- New collection methodology will be initiated in 2007-2008 as outlined in this indicator.
- Indicator 5- Did not meet target. New targets proposed for State Performance Plan. See Indicator for details.
- Indicator 6- Target met.
- Indicator 7- Three CDSAs with findings of noncompliance for 2007-2008. Corrective action taken.
- Indicator 8a- One CDSA with a finding; corrective action taken.
- Indicator 8 b- No findings
- Indicator 8 c- Three CDSAs with findings. Corrective action taken.
- Indicator 9- This indicator is the overall general supervision indicator. Reinstatement of monitoring during 2005-2006 after a program reorganization, a more effective general supervision system and the addition of a focused monitoring approach has enhanced the ability of program to identify and correct noncompliance in a timely manner. Improved compliance is noted in Indicator 1 as statewide strategies were effective. Additional drilldown of data has identified the continued need to work more intensely with six identified CDSAs through the corrective action plan process. Compliance for this indicator has increased from 43% for 2005-2006, to 88% for 2006-2007 and then to 100% for 2007-2008.
- Indicator 10-Reflects 100% complaints resolved in 60 days.
- Indicator 11- No findings; no due process hearings requested.
- Indicator 12-Not applicable to North Carolina as Part C due process procedures are used.
- Indicator 13- Reflects 100% compliance.
- Indicator 14- Reflects 100% compliance.

The North Carolina Early Intervention Program's general supervision system continues as previously submitted to OSEP for approval. The program continues to work towards implementation of a new data system, with the plan to alleviate the need for the intensive on-site record review process. OSEP has recently clarified the definition of "finding" in August 2008. The program has implemented this new clarification in the general supervision system and has applied it to all monitoring activities as of that date. Therefore the use of the term "unique isolated instances" will not be used, as previously provided by OSEP, in the state's general supervision system.

### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007 – 2008:**

See Addendum A for Technical Assistance related to this priority area.



**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007- 2008**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/General Supervision**

**Indicator 10:** Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 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 = (2.1(a) (i) divided by (2.1)) times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-2008	100%

**Actual Target Data for 2007-2008:**

The State lead agency received 2 written complaints in FFY 2007, and both were withdrawn by the families involved. The specific written complaints are not described, as they may be personally identifiable.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-2008:**

North Carolina continues to emphasize resolution of disputes informally and to provide a system for families to easily access the state level (central office) management regarding complaints.

When complaints arise, the local programs (CDSAs) are encouraged to resolve those locally using informal mechanisms. An Early Intervention Branch Central Office Family Partnership Coordinator has also been used by families to assist in resolving complaints informally. When disputes cannot be successfully resolved at the local (CDSA) level and a signed written complaint is received by the North Carolina Early Intervention Program, the Family Partnership Coordinator works with the families and local programs to determine whether an informal resolution can be reached, and if not, to achieve resolution through the formal process.

The Family Partnership Coordinator continued to use a tracking system to ensure the provision of procedural safeguards and timelines were met.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-2008**

None.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007 – 2008**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

**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)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:**

Percent=(3.2(a) +3.2(b)) divided by (3.2) times 100

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 – 2008	100%

**Actual Target Data for 2007-2008:**

There were no due process hearing requests in 2007-2008.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007 – 2008:**

Not applicable.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-2008.**

None.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007 – 2008**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

**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 due process procedures are adopted).

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

This indicator is not applicable to North Carolina, as Part C due processes are used.

**Measurement:**

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 – 2008	<i>Not applicable</i>

**Actual Target Data for 2007-2008:**

Not applicable.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007 – 2008:**

Not applicable.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-2008.**

Not applicable.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007 – 2008**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

**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	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 – 2008	<i>Not applicable (NA)</i>

**Actual Target Data for 2007-2008: 100%**

The Family Partnership Coordinator, a State position in the North Carolina Early Intervention Central Office, continues to oversee the complaint resolution system in order to respond to complaints in a consistent and timely manner and ensure well-trained mediators are available for families.

There were two (2) requests for mediation in 2007-2008; one resulted in a mediation agreement. The other request was pending for 2007-2008 due to receipt of the request at the end of the fiscal year. The specific mediation agreement is not described, as it may be personally identifiable.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007 – 2008:**

Not Applicable.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-2008:**

None.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007 – 2008**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision**

**Indicator 14:** State reported data (618, State Performance Plan, and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

**Measurement:**

State reported data, including 618 data, State performance plan, and annual performance reports, 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 accuracy).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 – 2008	100%

**Actual Target Data for 2007-2008: 100%**

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	n/a	n/a	n/a
13	1	1	2
		<b>Subtotal</b>	28
<b>APR Score Calculation</b>	<b>Timely Submission Points</b> (5 pts for submission of APR/SPP by February 2, 2009)		5
	<b>Grand Total</b>		33

Indicator 14 - 618 Data					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Date Note Requests	Total
Table 1 – Child Count Due Date: 2/1/08	1	1	1	1	4
Table 2 – Settings Due Date: 2/1/08	1	1	1	1	4
Table 3 – Exiting Due Date: 11/1/08	1	1	1	NA	3
Table 4 – Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/08	1	1	1	N/A	3
				<b>Subtotal</b>	14
				<b>Weighted Total</b> (subtotal X 2.5; round ≤ .49 down and ≥ .50 up to whole number)	35
Indicator # 14 Calculation					
			A. APR Total	33	
			B. 618 Total	35	
			C. Grand Total	68	
Percent of timely and accurate data = (C divided by 68 times 100)			(C) / (68) X 100 =		100%

Early Intervention (EI) Branch Central Office Quality Improvement staff clarified the results of the self-assessment data submitted to the state office around the compliance indicators. This ensured that the data were reported accurately and consistently across CDSAs.

EI Branch Central Office staff worked with staff at the CDSAs to ensure that their data in the Comprehensive Exceptional Children Accountability System (CECAS), the database that is used for 618 reporting, is accurate through periodic data-cleaning activities. Focused technical assistance was provided as needed.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-2008:**

Development has continued on a new data system, the Health Information System (HIS), for the North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services. The core product is being implemented for the Division of Public Health, of which the North Carolina Early Intervention Program is a part. HIS will collect client specific data needed for reporting 618 data as well as data for the compliance indicators in the APR.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-2009:**

None.

# Addendum A

## STATE TA PLANNING & DOCUMENTATION FOR PRIORITY NEEDS

State: NC \_\_\_\_\_

Part B \_\_\_ Part C \_X\_

Start Date:6/2008

OSEP PRIORITY NEEDS	STATE SPECIFIC TA	DATE	REGIONAL/MULTI REGIONAL EVENT		WEB BASED PRODUCTS	NATIONAL CONF	OTHER TA
			FACE TO FACE	TELECONF			
Child Find Indicators 5 & 6	<b>TA Provider:</b> Midsouth <b>Type:</b> Assistance with Stakeholder's Meeting <b>Scope:</b> To discuss making recommendations to change targets for Birth to 1 and review Birth to 3, discuss development of self assessment toolkit <b>Actions:</b> Recommendations identified on 2007-2008 APR, see report and recommendation of new strategy	11/2008	<b>Event:</b> <b>Topic:</b> <b>Date:</b> <b>Actions:</b>	<b>Event:</b> <b>Topic:</b> <b>Date:</b> <b>Actions:</b>	<b>Product:</b> Reviewed Child find charts, APRs from other states, RRFC calendar related to "investigative questions" and NECTAC's "Indicator analysis" document <b>TA Provider:</b> NECTAC; Midsouth <b>Actions:</b> To provide support for recommendation to change target for Birth to 1 and support for no change to Birth to 3.	<b>Conf:</b> <b>Session:</b> <b>Actions:</b>	<b>TA:</b> <b>Actions:</b>
Measuring Child Outcomes	<b>TA Provider:</b> <b>Type:</b> <b>Scope:</b> <b>Actions:</b>		<b>Event:</b> <b>Topic:</b> <b>Actions:</b>	<b>Event:</b> <b>Topic:</b> <b>Date:</b> <b>Actions:</b>	<b>Product:</b> <b>TA Provider:</b> <b>Actions:</b>	<b>Conf:</b> Measuring Child & Family Outcomes August 27-28, 2008 <b>Session:</b> All Plenary discussions & sessions specific to child outcomes <b>Actions:</b> Applied general TA to implementing quality assurance activities related to child outcomes. Training planned for local programs.	<b>TA:</b> <b>Actions:</b>
Child Outcomes and Non-compliance	<b>TA Provider:</b> <b>Type:</b> <b>Scope:</b> <b>Actions:</b>		<b>Event:</b> <b>Topic:</b> <b>Date:</b> <b>Actions:</b>	<b>Event:</b> <b>Topic:</b> <b>Date:</b> <b>Actions:</b>	<b>Product:</b> <b>TA Provider:</b> <b>Actions:</b>	<b>Conf:</b> 2008 OSEP National Early Childhood Conf. <b>Session:</b> Using Child Outcome Data & Using Data to Correct Non-compliance Workshops <b>Actions:</b> Applying general TA to	<b>TA:</b> <b>Actions:</b>

						inform Child Outcome data analysis & system design.	
<b>OTHER STATE PRIORITY NEEDS</b>							
Indicator 4. Family Outcomes	<b>TA Provider:</b> <b>Type:</b> <b>Scope:</b> <b>Actions:</b>		<b>Event:</b> <b>Topic:</b> <b>Date:</b> <b>Actions:</b>	<b>Event:</b> <b>Topic:</b> <b>Date:</b> <b>Actions:</b>	<b>Product:</b> <b>TA Provider:</b> <b>Actions:</b>	<b>Conf: Conf:</b> 2008 OSEP National Early Childhood Conf. 8/08 <b>Session:</b> Are Your C4 Data Reflective of the Families You Serve? <b>Actions:</b> Altered how we report family outcome data in the APR and family survey distribution methodology.	<b>TA:</b> <b>Actions:</b>
Indicator 4. Family Outcomes	<b>TA Provider:</b> <b>Type:</b> <b>Scope:</b> <b>Actions:</b>		<b>Event:</b> <b>Topic:</b> <b>Date:</b> <b>Actions:</b>	<b>Event:</b> <b>Topic:</b> <b>Date:</b> <b>Actions:</b>	<b>Product: Product:</b> Webinar <b>TA Provider:</b> Avatar International <b>Actions:</b> Altered how family surveys are distributed to improve response rate	<b>Conf:</b> <b>Session:</b> <b>Actions:</b>	<b>TA:</b> <b>Actions:</b>
Timely Services Indicator 1  General Supervision Indicator 9	<b>TA Provider: MidSouth</b> <b>Type:</b> <b>Scope:</b> <b>Actions:</b>		<b>Event:Nectac/Mid south- Training for statewide Quality Assurance State Staff and local Coors.</b> <b>Topic: Anne Lucas: Accountability for Improving Performance</b> <b>Date: 6/2/2008</b> <b>Actions: Used to develop more accurate Corrective Action Plans. Local implementation of using an</b>	<b>Event:</b> <b>Topic:</b> <b>Date:</b> <b>Actions:</b>	<b>Product: MidSouth Service Agreement (7/21/2008)</b> <b>TA Provider: MidSouth</b> <b>Actions: Used to guide technical assistance using a systematic approach</b>	<b>Conf: 2008 National Accountability Conference (August 25-26) 2008</b> <b>Session: Plenary Sessions and sessions related to service delivery</b> <b>Actions:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Used information to guide a statewide Early Intervention Branch management meeting on assessing the program's service delivery system on Nov 12-13, 2008.</li> <li>Developed a more integrated approach to general supervision</li> </ul>	<b>TA:</b> <b>Actions:</b>



			investigative model of examining contributing factors to improve performance			that will be used in 2008-2009 monitoring cycle.	
<b>OTHER STATE PRIORITY NEEDS</b>							
Continued			Event: Mid south Regional Forum Topic: Improvement Activity Systems Date: Nov 5-6 Actions: Statewide Early Intervention Branch meeting held on November 12-13, 2008 to examine current early intervention system and developed measurable, results based improvement strategies	Event: Webinar Topic: Thinking Through Improvement Tools and Strategies to Guide Improvement Efforts Date: 8/20/2008 Actions: Use to develop APR; Assist in developing an integrated general supervision system	Product: TA Provider: Actions:	Conf: Conf: Session: Actions:	TA: Actions:
Continued			Event: Midsouth Part C Coordinator's meeting Topic: General Date: Nov 7, 2008 Actions: Used strategies discussed by other states to inform leadership in NC to examine other	Event: Webinar Topic: State Improvement Systems Date: 10/23/2008 Actions: Used to develop APR for Indicator 1 and 9. Specific technical assistance	Product: TA Provider: Actions:	Conf: Session: Actions:	TA: Actions:

			service delivery models	requested from Midsouth and NECTAC			
Indicator 9	<b>TA Provider: Type:</b> <b>Scope:</b> <b>Actions:</b>		<b>Event:</b> <b>Topic:</b> <b>Date:</b> <b>Actions:</b>	<b>Event:</b> <b>Topic:</b> <b>Date:</b> <b>Actions:</b>	<b>Product: RRFC SPP/APR Planning Calendar</b> <b>TA Provider: RRFC</b> <b>Actions:</b>  <b>(1) Reviewed: "Addressing Non Compliance in APR"-</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Trained State Monitoring Team Leaders using this tool</b></li> </ul> <b>(2) "Early Intervention Monitoring Manual"- Wyoming</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Using Corrective Action Plan checklists to assess State's Corrective Action Plans in 2008-2009</b></li> <li>• <b>Developed State tracking tool to monitor when Corrective Action Plans are issued and when non-compliance is corrected</b></li> </ul> <b>(3) "Definitions related to C-9"</b>	<b>Conf:</b> <b>Session:</b> <b>Actions:</b>	<b>TA:</b> <b>Actions:</b>

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Trained all State Monitoring Staff; Trained all local program Quality Assurance Coordinators</b></li> </ul>		

(See Back for Instructions)

### INSTRUCTIONS

Enter **PLANNED annual activity & after TA occurs complete for end of year DOCUMENTATION**. Year refers to period from 2-1 to 1-31 in which TA is provided.

**State:** Identify the state    **Part B or C:** Mark which Part    **Start Date:** Enter the date of first entry into form.

**OSEP PRIORITY NEEDS:** Identified by OSEP in Determination letters.

**OTHER STATE PRIORITY NEEDS:** Identify an Indicator or topic area that the state sees as a priority and for which TA will be needed.

#### STATE SPECIFIC TA:

- Identify the TA Provider (e.g. MSRRC, NCCRESt, collaborative of NECTAC/MSRRC)
- Identify the type of TA activity (e.g. facilitate and provide guidance to stakeholder group, lead planning session(s), expert consultation)
- Identify scope of TA (multiple face-to-face events over one year period, periodic contacts for review/revisions, periodic consultation via email/phone over one year) If single event, indicate date provided under scope.
- Identify actions state took as a result of the TA

**DATE:** Enter date TA started and date completed (use font size 8). If multi-year TA, consider the end date to be the end of the period 2-1 to 1-31. Reference continuation in second year. If single event, enter same date as date provided under scope

#### REGIONAL/MULTI REGIONAL EVENT FACE TO FACE & TELECONF:

- Identify event organizer(s) (e.g. NECTAC)
- Identify topic
- Identify date(s)
- Identify actions state took as a result of the TA

#### WEB BASED PRODUCTS

- Identify the product
- Identify the TA Provider

- Identify actions state took as a result of the TA

#### **NATIONAL CONFERENCE**

- Identify the conference
- Identify the sessions
- Identify actions state took as a result of the TA

#### **PRIORITY TEAMS**

- Identify the Team
- Identify the resource
- Identify actions state took as a result of the TA

#### **OTHER**

- Identify the TA
- Identify actions state took as a result of the TA