

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
PART C STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN
FOR
2005-2010

JANUARY 25, 2006

Part C State Performance Plan for 2005 – 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | Page |
|---------------------|---|------|
| Overview | State Performance Plan Development | 1 |
| Indicator 1 | Services provided in a timely manner | 3 |
| Indicator 2 | Services in the home or programs for typically developing children. | 6 |
| Indicator 3 | Child Outcomes | 8 |
| Indicator 4 | Family Outcomes | 11 |
| Indicator 5 | Percent served under age 1 | 13 |
| Indicator 6 | Percent served under age 3 | 16 |
| Indicator 7 | Evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting conducted within 45-day timeline. | 18 |
| Indicator 8 | Timely transition planning. | 21 |
| 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. | 24 |
| Indicator 10 | Complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60 day. | 27 |
| Indicator 11 | Due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline. | 29 |
| Indicator 12 | Hearing requests that went to resolution sessions (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted). Not applicable for California Part C | 31 |
| Indicator 13 | Mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. | 32 |
| Indicator 14 | Timely state reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report). | 34 |

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) of 2004 requires states to have a State Performance Plan (SPP) for implementing the requirements and purposes of the IDEA. In California, the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) is the Lead Agency for Part C of IDEA. Part C is the early intervention service program for infants and toddlers (birth to 36 months of age). DDS employed a public input and review process through the state's Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) and its four subcommittees to develop the SPP. The ICC, which is appointed by the Governor, is comprised of a broad and representative cross-section of the state's stakeholders. In addition, there are ICC Community Representatives who are appointed by the ICC Chair. Together, the ICC and ICC Community Representatives include parents, early intervention service providers, the allied departments in state government and other interested parties including representatives from the following: Family Resource Center Network of California (FRCNCA), child care, Head Start/Early Head Start, Association of Regional Center Agencies' Prevention Committee, local education agencies, American Academy of Pediatrics, University professors, Protection and Advocacy Inc., the Infant Development Association and other entities.

On September 22, 2005, DDS made a presentation to the ICC on the requirements of the SPP. The required SPP indicators were assigned to ICC committees for discussion and recommendations over two meetings. The committees discussed the indicators, received public input and developed recommendations for targets and goals. On November 18, 2005, the recommendations for SPP indicator targets were approved by the ICC and submitted to DDS.

Over the past two years DDS has worked with the ICC representatives as they developed recommendations in a state strategic planning process for improvement of the Part C system, known as Early Start in California. This activity resulted in 33 recommendations that the ICC submitted to DDS in September 2005. The recommendations address activities for system improvement in the following priority areas: early entry into Early Start, the Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) process and requirements, transition from Early Start, and interagency collaboration. The ICC recommendations will be sent to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) under separate cover.

DDS will convene with the ICC in January 2006, to continue collaborative discussions on SPP improvement activities in conjunction with the state's next strategic planning cycle. We will also further refine timelines and identify additional resource needs in light of ongoing efforts to implement the SPP. The ICC will continue to provide advice and assistance on the implementation of the SPP. DDS will update the ICC on the progress of the Early Start SPP in their regularly scheduled quarterly meetings.

The SPP will be posted on the Early Start website at www.dds.ca.gov/EarlyStart. DDS will announce the completion of the SPP and refer people to its location on the Early Start website.

The SPP follows a prescribed format set by OSEP. Monitoring Priorities, the 14 Performance Indicators, and Measurement formulas were determined by OSEP. California’s response is identified for each indicator. OSEP requires states to set “measurable and rigorous” targets for meeting the performance indicators over the next six Federal Fiscal Years. The SPP projects performance targets beginning with the current 2005-06 year through 2010-11, which coincide with California’s State Fiscal Year periods. Subsequent Annual Performance Reports submitted to OSEP will provide progress reports on meeting the targets.

| |
|--|
| <p>Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments</p> |
|--|

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)

| |
|----------------------------|
| <p>Measurement:</p> |
|----------------------------|

| |
|---|
| <p>Percent equals number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner divided by the total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs times 100.</p> |
|---|

| |
|--|
| <p>States must account for untimely receipt of services.</p> |
|--|

CALIFORNIA'S RESPONSE

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

In California, timely delivery of services is a primary goal of the Early Start program. Timeliness is defined in this measure as provision of service within 75 days of initial referral. The measurement of timeliness is derived from data entered on the Early Start Report, which is the data tracking form used for all Early Start participants. Status on meeting the requirement to provide services in a timely manner is collected during compliance monitoring activities. Compliance monitoring activities consist of Site Monitoring Visits and ongoing record reviews. The Site Monitoring Visit is a comprehensive review of the local Early Start program including assessment of the eligibility process, service coordination, interagency collaboration, service provision and family support. Samples of individual child records are reviewed to assess compliance with the procedural requirements. Service providers and families are interviewed.

These comprehensive triennial reviews are conducted in each of the 21 regional center catchment areas by DDS in collaboration with CDE and a monitoring team including parents and an ICC representative. On a periodic basis, DDS liaisons revisit regional centers to conduct record reviews as follow-up activity to the Site Monitoring Visits. This provides an assessment of the local program's progress in resolving any compliance issues and identification of any new findings.

Baseline Data for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2004 (2004-2005):

California's data from 2004-2005 revealed that 96.54 percent of infants and toddlers served received timely services (measurement formula: 25,728 divided by 26,649, times 100 equals 96.54 percent).

Discussion of Baseline Data:

This baseline was calculated by measuring time from the IFSP completion date to when the purchase of service order is processed. This yields a statistical basis for setting a baseline and establishes methodology for continuous assessment of this measure.

OSEP requires a target of 100 percent for this indicator.

| Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------------|---|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 100% of participants receive services in a timely manner. |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 100% of participants receive services in a timely manner. |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 100% of participants receive services in a timely manner. |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 100% of participants receive services in a timely manner. |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 100% of participants receive services in a timely manner. |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 100% of participants receive services in a timely manner. |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

DDS has designated Early Start liaisons that work collaboratively with local programs to improve their performance. The Early Start liaisons form a collegial relationship with the regional centers and provide frequent informal technical assistance on all Early Start issues. Focused training is also provided by the Early Start liaisons based on unique local needs and issues. California's Early Start also has a structured formal training and personnel development system. DDS maintains a contract with the WestEd Center for Prevention and Early Intervention to provide ongoing statewide training institutes for early intervention service providers and service coordinators. This comprehensive system of personnel development ensures that early intervention personnel are appropriately trained and also have knowledge of the regulatory requirements of Early Start. DDS will also be meeting with the ICC in January 2006, to identify additional improvement activities, timelines and resources for the SPP performance indicators.

Most frequently, services are delayed due to a shortage of qualified personnel, especially specialty therapists (occupational, speech and physical therapists). DDS has implemented a mechanism to allow regional centers to use an Early Start specialized therapeutic service code to purchase services in cases where application of existing reimbursement rates would result in any delays in the provision of early intervention services. The use of this service code allows the regional centers to compete fiscally in

a competitive market for services and serves to improve the timeliness of both the evaluation/assessment and the provision of services.

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Please refer to overview of SPP development on page 1.

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

CALIFORNIA'S RESPONSE

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

With the reauthorization of IDEA in 1997, and the issuance of Part C Federal Regulations in 1999, there was a strengthened focus on the importance of providing services in natural environments. Since then, DDS provided statewide training and other forms of technical assistance to promote the provision of services in natural environments. The philosophy of providing early intervention services within the child's "everyday routine, relationships, activities, places, and partnerships" was also incorporated into all ongoing training institutes for service providers and service coordinators. The provision of services in natural environments is assessed by triennial site monitoring visits and ongoing record reviews. Federal regulations make allowance for the delivery of an early intervention service in a setting other than a natural environment only if early intervention cannot be achieved satisfactorily for the infant or toddler in a natural environment. In such cases, there must be a justification in the child's IFSP. The percent of children in Early Start who either receive services in a natural environment or have a justification for services in another environment is over 90 percent of children served.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Early Start infants and toddlers receive services in the natural environments 82.95 percent of the time (measurement formula: 23,873 divided by 28,781, times 100 equals 82.95 percent). An additional 10.53 percent of infants are served in other than natural environments and there is a justification document in the case record that early intervention services cannot be satisfactorily achieved in a natural environment. That is, when services are provided in other than natural environments and a justification is included in the total percentage, the total figure becomes 93.48% (26,904 divided by 28,781, times 100 equals 93.48 percent). This is based on performance data that indicates 61.76 percent of consumers who receive services in other than a natural environment had justifications present in the record.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The current figure of 82.95% represents a consistent level of performance on this indicator. When a justification for providing services in other than natural environments is present on the child's IFSP, California shows a significant continuous improvement in this area. Discussions with the State ICC focused on the need to probe for more information on those children who are not served in natural environments and for whom there is not documented justification. It may be that these children, the remaining 6.52 percent, may simply be missing the necessary documentation. Thus, the target for this indicator may change depending on the information gathered on the 6.52 percent missing documentation and without services in a natural environment.

The ICC recommended that by 2010, 90% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs should primarily receive early intervention services in the home or in programs for typically developing children.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 83.5% of infants and toddlers served will receive services in the natural environment. |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 85.5% of infants and toddlers served will receive services in the natural environment. |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 87% of infants and toddlers served will receive services in the natural environment. |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 88% of infants and toddlers served will receive services in the natural environment. |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 89% of infants and toddlers served will receive services in the natural environment. |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 90% of infants and toddlers served will receive services in the natural environment. |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

For an overview of California's improvement approach, see page 4, Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for Indicator 1, paragraph one.

Local Early Start programs will continue to be monitored for this area of compliance. Regional centers and LEAs will be offered training and technical assistance to help them meet the state's annual goals, when necessary. Timelines for correction will be set based on local needs but in no case longer than one year from the date of the finding of non-compliance.

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Please refer to overview of SPP development on page 1.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 3: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

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

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

Measurement:

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

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers equals number of infants and toddlers who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed times 100.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improve functioning equals number of infants and toddlers who improved functioning divided by number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed times 100.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning equals number of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning divided by number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed times 100.

If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If a plus b plus c does not sum to 100 percent, explain the difference.

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

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers equals number of infants and toddlers who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed times 100.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning equals number of infants and toddlers who improved functioning divided by number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed times 100.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning equals number of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning divided by number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed times 100.

If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If a plus b plus c does not sum to 100 percent, explain the difference.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers equals number of infants and toddlers who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed times 100.

- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning equals number of infants and toddlers who improved functioning divided by number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed times 100.
 - c. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning equals number of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning divided by number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed times 100.
- If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If a plus b plus c does not sum to 100 percent, explain the difference.

CALIFORNIA’S RESPONSE

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

This is a new measurement requirement from OSEP. See Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources below for description of the proposed process to collect this data.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Baseline data will be established in the coming performance year.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The ICC recommended that the target for this indicator be developed once baseline data is known.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|----------------------------|---|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | Target to be developed once baseline data is known. |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | Target to be developed once baseline data is known. |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | Target to be developed once baseline data is known. |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | Target to be developed once baseline data is known. |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | Target to be developed once baseline data is known. |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | Target to be developed once baseline data is known. |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

California will gather infant and toddler outcome data from the existing assessment data on infants and toddlers served in the program. As OSEP's contractor, the Early Childhood Outcome Center (ECO) is constructing a crosswalk from the commonly used assessment instruments to the outcome areas. This crosswalk will be used to generate the outcomes from a sample of clinical records. Using a standard statistical formula, Early Start will utilize a representative sample at the 95 percent confidence level. DDS liaison staff will gather the data during record reviews. Baseline data will be collected over the next 12 months.

Based on an analysis of the baseline data, target timelines will be developed to ensure child outcomes are measured and continuously improved.

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Please refer to overview of SPP development on page 1.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 4: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

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

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

Measurement:

- A. Percent equals number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights divided by the number of respondent families participating in Part C times 100.
- B. Percent equals number 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 number of respondent families participating in Part C times 100.
- C. Percent equals the number 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 number of respondent families participating in Part C times 100.

CALIFORNIA'S RESPONSE

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

This is a new measurement requirement from OSEP. See Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources below for a description of the proposed process to collect this data.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Baseline date will be established in the coming performance year.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|---|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | Target to be developed once baseline data is known. |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | Target to be developed once baseline data is known. |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | Target to be developed once baseline data is known. |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | Target to be developed once baseline data is known. |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | Target to be developed once baseline data is known. |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | Target to be developed once baseline data is known. |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Early Start will take advantage of the work of OSEP's contractor, the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM), in conducting our parent survey within the next 12 months. Early Start will derive parent learning progress data from that survey. Early Start will utilize a contractor to employ a statewide sample of families to conduct this survey. Early Start is anticipating taking advantage of the work of NCSEAM while ensuring some longitudinal capability by replicating some items from California's 2001 parent survey.

Based on analysis of the baseline data, target timelines will be developed to ensure outcomes are measured to address the focus of continuous improvement efforts in this area.

The survey items will also have some utility in the future with the sampling of families interviewed during Site Monitoring Visits. The survey questions will also be incorporated in the focus group activities during Site Monitoring Visits. Stakeholder input also recommends looking at the Family Empowerment Scale as a tool to measure this performance indicator. Early Start will explore the utility of this instrument and determine the most suitable approach.

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

Please refer to overview of SPP development on page 1.

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.

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

Measurement:

- A. Percent compared to the most nearly comparable state with a Broad definition of eligibility.
- B. The percent in the national data.

CALIFORNIA'S RESPONSE**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

This analysis is made possible by using the comparison table offered by OSEP for the categorization of the various eligibility criteria. Using the list provided, California determined that Texas was the most comparable state in terms of eligibility criteria and also in matching geographic size, demography, urban-rural mix, ethnic mix and migration patterns. California's data include infants and toddlers served by both DDS and CDE.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

A. The percentage of California's population served under the age of one year equals .95 percent (measurement formula: 5,643 divided by 595,039, times 100 equals 0.95 percent).

This compares favorably to the Texas 0.81 percent and the national percentage of 0.92 percent (3,054 divided by 378,946, times 100 equals 0.81 percent). The Texas data is derived from OSEP table 8-4 entitled "Infants under 1 year of age receiving early intervention services under IDEA."

B. The percent in the national data is .92 percent (38,192 divided by 4,143,461, times 100 equals .92 percent).

Discussion of Baseline Data:

California compares favorably with both Texas and the National figures. California reported in the 2003-2004 Annual Performance Report (APR) that all 21 regional centers have liaison activities with Neonatal Intensive Care Units (NICU). These

activities include discharge planning with hospital staff to provide continuity of care between hospital and home. Early Head Start is also a partner with Early Start in the identification and assessment of children. Through the use of the Hilton Special Quest Grant, Early Head Start has begun assessing siblings and other children in their communities using the Infant Development Scale. DDS is also working with the California Department of Social Services on implementing the policies and procedures for making and receiving referrals from Child Protective Services per the requirements of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA). This ensures prompt response to referrals of children from these agencies.

The ICC recommended the national average as the target for this indicator. However, since California exceeds the national average the target is set to maintain the current high level of performance.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | .95% of infants and toddlers birth to one in California will have IFSPs. |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | .95% of infants and toddlers birth to one in California will have IFSPs. |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | .95% of infants and toddlers birth to one in California will have IFSPs. |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | .95% of infants and toddlers birth to one in California will have IFSPs. |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | .95% of infants and toddlers birth to one in California will have IFSPs. |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | .96% of infants and toddlers birth to one in California will have IFSPs. * |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

For an overview of California's improvement approach, see page 4, Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for Indicator 1, paragraph one.

Child find is a high priority in California. In addition to the State's ongoing improvement activities, a revised public outreach and referral brochure entitled Reasons for Concern was developed in collaboration with CDE. This publication is currently being pilot tested in three regional center catchment areas to determine if it has an impact on the referrals of eligible children. This publication is more persuasive and has an easily understood

message about when to refer a child for early childhood services. Statewide use of the brochure will be based on the results of this pilot.

In Los Angeles, the BEST PCP (Primary Care Physicians) project has begun using a standardized assessment for pediatric patients. Of all Californians, 27.92 percent reside in Los Angeles County. Therefore, a more systematic developmental assessment of young children should yield increased numbers of referrals to Early Start programs in the southern California region.

In California, 21 key child-find activities have been identified and the regional centers have been ranked according to these activities. The Public Awareness Committee of the ICC will assist Early Start by making recommendations based on data presented to them as to which of these activities are most strongly associated with high referral rates of eligible infants and toddlers.

Further, we anticipate a continued increase in the percent served due to the statewide implementation of the Newborn Hearing Screening Program. California is currently providing hearing screening for 70 percent of all newborns. Finally, the expansion of the Newborn Genetic Screening Program is also expected to increase referrals to Early Start. More than 50 conditions have been added to the genetic screening protocol.

DDS is in discussions with CDE to develop data sets and data merges to allow a longitudinal perspective of children who have transitioned from Part C to other CDE programs. The two departments will study the hypothesis that children served in Part C programs require fewer special education services in Part B than children with identical conditions whose parents refused Part C services.

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

Please refer to overview of SPP development on page 1.

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.

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

Measurement:

- A. Percent infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs the population of infants and toddlers birth to 3;
- B. The national baseline.

CALIFORNIA'S RESPONSE**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

This analysis is made possible by using the comparison table offered by OSEP for the categorization of the various eligibility criteria. Using the list provided, California determined that Texas was the most comparable state. Texas was determined to match because of geographic size, demography, urban-rural mix, ethnic mix and migration patterns. California's data includes infants and toddlers served by both DDS and CDE.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

- A. California's percent served birth to 36 months of age equals 1.74 percent (measurement formula: 28,781 divided by 1,653,968, times 100.) Texas' percent equals 1.84 percent (20,641 divided by 1,121,408, times 100.)
- B. The national baseline is 2.20 percent. (Source: Table 8-5 Infants and Toddlers ages birth to 36 months of age, from the federal resource center website.)

Discussion of Baseline Data:

When annual figures are used instead of point in time data, California serves 2.82 percent. California graduates successful infants and toddlers as they progress and no longer need services or reach age 3 years. The "point-in-time" calculation formula may serve to underestimate the percent of children served. Texas also uses the community-based approach.

It should be noted that California is not comparable to many of the states on the "broad eligibility list" provided by OSEP, such as Hawaii. Hawaii's early intervention program has a much broader eligibility criterion than California. They provide services under a

medical services agency and therefore include many children that are served in other programs in California.

Furthermore, California has significant prevention efforts that contribute to a lower than average number of reported birth defects. Those differences include: higher rates of mothers receiving prenatal care, more attended births, lower rates of mothers who smoke and fewer mothers who labor beyond 24 hours due to Caesarian sections being performed for prolonged birthing.

Regardless, the lead agency will examine the variance across regions in percent served and provide the technical assistance to those regions with the lowest percentages. It should be noted that the range across the 21 regions is from .68 percent to 2.50 percent.

The ICC recommended that by 2010, 2.20 percent of infants and toddlers birth to three in California have IFSPs. This target equals the national average. However, California outperforms the national average in many correlates of a healthy birth outcome including better prenatal care, fewer teen pregnancies, fewer women who smoke, fewer preterm births, fewer newborns with low birth weight, etc. Therefore, DDS believes these efforts in primary prevention must be considered in setting these targets and therefore has adjusted the target to 2% of children birth to three years old.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|----------------------------|---|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 1.76% of infants and toddlers birth to three in California will have IFSPs. |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 1.80% of infants and toddlers birth to three in California will have IFSPs. |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 1.85% of infants and toddlers birth to three in California will have IFSPs. |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 1.90% of infants and toddlers birth to three in California will have IFSPs. |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 1.95% of infants and toddlers birth to three in California will have IFSPs. |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 2.00% of infants and toddlers birth to three in California will have IFSPs. |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

See Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources under Indicator 5 above.

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Please refer to overview of SPP development on page 1.

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 equals number 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 number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed times 100.

States must also account for untimely evaluations.

CALIFORNIA'S RESPONSE

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Evaluation and assessment requirements and initial IFSP meeting timelines are compliance items monitored by ongoing record reviews and triennial site monitoring visits. Regional centers are credited with this item based on timeliness and completeness of evaluations and assessments. IFSPs that are based on incomplete data are not credited. To correct this, centers have technical assistance provided by DDS staff aimed at marshalling the resources to come into compliance within one year of the non-compliance finding.

In OSEP's September 30, 2005 letter to DDS, California was directed to address plans to improve performance in this area in the SPP. The OSEP letter was in response to the State's April 19, 2005 submission of the Federal Fiscal Year 2003 Annual Performance Report. Specifically, the State was directed to ensure compliance with the requirement that initial evaluations and assessments are completed, and an initial IFSP meeting is convened with 45 days from referral. California must also ensure that IFSPs include a statement of the child's present level of development in five areas: cognitive development; physical development, including vision and hearing; communication development; social or emotional development; and adaptive development.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Baseline data from 2004-05 indicates that 72.38 percent of children have their evaluation and assessment completed and have an initial IFSP meeting held within 45 days of referral (measurement formula: 422 divided by 583, times 100 equals 72.38 percent.)

Discussion of Baseline Data:

This 72.38% represents slippage from the prior reporting years (87.66% and 84.5%, respectively). Often during the first IFSP meeting, it is determined that additional assessments in specific areas are needed to determine additional service needs. When this requires the services of specialty therapists (speech, occupational, physical and/or sensory integration therapists) or personnel experienced in early childhood vision and/or hearing impairments, there can be delays in obtaining the assessments. Further, regional centers have been held to the standard of having completed both initial evaluations and also more comprehensive evaluations in the same specialty areas if the initial evaluation indicates a need for a more comprehensive evaluation. California will continue to dialogue with OSEP regarding the evaluations and assessments required within the first 45 days, as it is likely that California is much closer to the required standard than our reported percent for this indicator.

Finally, the State continues to experience shortages of these qualified professionals required to conduct the evaluations in the different specialty areas.

OSEP requires a target of 100 percent for this indicator.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|----------------------------|---|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 100% of children have evaluation, assessment and IFSP meeting within 45 days. |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 100% of children have evaluation, assessment and IFSP meeting within 45 days. |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 100% of children have evaluation, assessment and IFSP meeting within 45 days. |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 100% of children have evaluation, assessment and IFSP meeting within 45 days. |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 100% of children have evaluation, assessment and IFSP meeting within 45 days. |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 100% of children have evaluation, assessment and IFSP meeting within 45 days. |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

For an overview of California's improvement approach, see page 4, Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for Indicator 1, paragraph one.

In major urban areas the private sector is able to out bid the regional centers for the scarce therapists available. DDS has implemented a mechanism to allow regional centers to use an Early Start specialized therapeutic service code to purchase services in cases where application of existing rates would result in any delays in the provision of early intervention services. The use of this service code continues to improve the timeliness of both the evaluation and assessment and the provision of services. DDS will also be working with the ICC to identify improvement activities to focus on creating a greater supply of providers in high demand occupations. Finally, DDS will continue to partner with the University of California Medical Schools to improve the professional expertise of community clinicians to promote increased access to quality services.

Local programs are encouraged to initiate services in a timely manner for all services determined at the initial IFSP meeting. Additional service needs identified in subsequent assessments will be initiated as soon as possible. The annual goals for improvement in this area of performance will be shared with the regional center programs and their progress toward the goal will be made part of Early Start Statistics Report. This report lists key performance indicators and is shared with the centers and the ICC. DDS is also collaborating with CDE to develop strategies such as joint training of LEAs, collaborative local technical assistance, state level planning meetings, and co-sponsorship of local pilot projects to improve the performance of LEAs in meeting this target.

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Please refer to overview of SPP development on page 1.

| |
|--|
| <p>Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition</p> |
|--|

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)

| |
|---|
| <p>Measurement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Percent equals number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services divided by number of children exiting Part C times 100. B. Percent equals number of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred divided by the number of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B times 100 C. Percent equals number of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred divided by the number of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B times 100. |
|---|

CALIFORNIA'S RESPONSE

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

This item is measured by reviewing the data found in the clinical record during periodic record reviews. The sampling is organized in such a way as to insure that some transition children are included in each record review.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Transition Steps: 90.24 percent (measurement formula: 34 divided by 41, times 100 equals 90.24 percent), LEA Notification: 91.89 percent. (34 divided by 37, times 100 equals 91.89 percent) and Transition Conference with LEA: 88.37 percent (39 divided by 43, times 100 equals 88.37 percent).

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Each regional center works with many LEAs. The extent of the communication and cooperation between them varies.

OSEP requires a target of 100 percent for this indicator.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| | Transition Steps | LEA Notification | Transition Conference |
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 100% | 100% | 100% |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

For an overview of California's improvement approach, see page 4, Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for Indicator 1, paragraph one.

The improvement strategy for this item will involve improvement in key components of the special education system. In the 2005-2006 year, Early Start and CDE began conducting Transition Workshops in locations across the state. These workshops communicate the requirements and importance of interagency communication at the point of transition for Early Start families and children.

Through training efforts, Early Start will share with regional centers the models that have been successful in many communities, such as identified agency contacts for the transition issues. This model identifies an LEA contact person to work with each Early Start office or service coordinator. This contact is available on a year around basis to facilitate the transition of Early Start referrals.

The SPPs for both DDS and CDE (Part B of IDEA) include indicators measuring the completion of transition from Part C to Part B by the child's third birthday. DDS and CDE will continue to foster collaboration between the regional centers and LEAs to achieve this goal. Further, DDS and CDE continue to improve their collaborative partnership with joint planning sessions, joint trainings of regional centers and LEAs, and also local pilot projects to field test service models focusing on outcome evaluation.

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Please refer to overview of SPP development on page 1.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 9: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

Measurement:

A. Percent of noncompliance related to monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:

- a. number of findings of noncompliance made related to priority areas.
- b. number of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent equals b divided by a times 100. See table entitled Monitoring Priorities for items not in compliance.

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

B. Percent of noncompliance related to areas not included in the above monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:

- a. number of findings of noncompliance made related to such areas.
- b. number of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent equals 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.

C. Percent of noncompliance identified through other mechanisms (complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc.) corrected within one year of identification:

- a. number of EIS programs in which noncompliance was identified through other mechanisms. (4)
- b. number of findings of noncompliance made. (5)
- c. number of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. (5)

Percent equals c divided by b 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.

CALIFORNIA'S RESPONSE

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

For this performance indicator, California does not currently collect comprehensive data in the categories that allow this type of comparison. Data for measurements A and B above was retrieved from the performance data that results from record reviews. The percentage used is the percentage of issues not cleared by the regional centers in each monitoring year. For measurement C above, these data are drawn from the DDS Office

of Human Rights and Advocacy Services (complaints) and the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) database (mediations and due process hearings). When there were findings of non-compliance that required correction by the local Early Start program, DDS found that all were promptly corrected well within a year of the finding.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

For parts A and B of this performance indicator, the finding equals 62.14 percent (measurement formula: 140 divided by 87, times 100 equals 62.14 percent).

For part C of this performance indicator, the finding equals 100 percent (5 divided by 5, times 100 equals 100 percent).

Discussion of Baseline Data:

California does not separate the priority indicators from all the performance items assessed in a year. Therefore, the total by regional center or the total of non-compliant items is not known. At the present time only the combination of noncompliance items can be reported. See data attachment, which is the “Part C – SPP/APR Attachment 1 Form”. The data presented are considered accurate in so far as the data listed and the total percent equals the total number of closed and open items for the year, regardless of the length of time they have been open. That is, many of the “open” items have been open for far less than 1 year. Please review the data table below for a regional center by regional center listing of findings and follow-up.

CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT
MONITORING MATRIX
2004-2005

| Regional Center | Items identified as requiring follow-up | Number of items cleared | Percentage of items cleared | New items identified |
|-----------------|---|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| ACRC | 7 | 2 | 28.57% | 4 |
| CVRC | 4 | 3 | 75.00% | |
| GGRC | 9 | 3 | 33.33% | |
| IRC | 8 | 2 | 25.00% | |
| KRC | 7 | 3 | 42.86% | |
| NBRC | 9 | 1 | 11.11% | |
| RCEB | 5 | 3 | 60.00% | |
| RCOC | 34 | 32 | 94.12% | |
| RCRC | 3 | 3 | 100.00% | |
| SGPRC | 8 | 8 | 100.00% | 1 |
| SCLARC | 3 | 3 | 100.00% | |
| VMRC | 16 | 8 | 50.00% | |
| WRC | 21 | 16 | 76.19% | 1 |
| Totals | 134 | 87 | 64.93% | 6 |

OSEP requires a target of 100 percent for this indicator.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|
| | Items A and B | Item C |
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 100% | 100% |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 100% | 100% |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 100% | 100% |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 100% | 100% |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 100% | 100% |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 100% | 100% |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

California is in the process of revising the data collection categories for this indicator in order to report the required data elements. For an overview of other improvement strategies for California, see page 4, Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for Indicator 1, paragraph one.

For item A in this performance indicator, the data collection procedure will be improved to allow accurate measurement of this item in the format designated. The data collected for 2005-2006 will be a more suitable measure of the state’s performance in this area. A database will be constructed that separates the SPP priorities from the rest of the performance data and reporting will become routine in subsequent years.

DDS and CDE will notify the regional centers and LEAs of the requirement to complete corrections of non-compliance within one year of the finding. Technical assistance will be provided to under performing centers/LEAs and training provided on compliance issues will emphasize the need to correct these issues promptly.

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

Please refer to overview of SPP development on page 1.

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 equals (1.1(b) plus 1.1(c)) divided by (1.1) times 100.

Measurement:

Percent equals (number of reports within timeline plus number of reports within extended timelines) divided by total number of complaints with reports issued times 100.

CALIFORNIA'S RESPONSE**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

All complaints dealing with children and families served by the regional centers or served dually by the regional centers and the LEA are investigated through the DDS Office of Human Rights and Advocacy Services. Children with a solely low incidence disability have complaints resolved through the CDE complaints management system. Of the 6 complaints reported below, two of six were CDE complaints.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The current data indicates that complaints are resolved within the 60 day timeline 100 percent of the time (measurement formula: 5 plus 1 divided by 6, times 100 equals 100 percent.) Also see the data attachment for a display of this data.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The complaint system is functioning at an excellent level in terms of the performance on timelines. California meets the OSEP required target of 100 percent for this indicator.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <p>2005 (2005-2006)</p> | <p>100% of reports will be complete within 60 days.</p> |
| <p>2006 (2006-2007)</p> | <p>100% of reports will be complete within 60 days.</p> |
| <p>2007 (2007-2008)</p> | <p>100% of reports will be complete within 60 days.</p> |
| <p>2008 (2008-2009)</p> | <p>100% of reports will be complete within 60 days.</p> |
| <p>2009 (2009-2010)</p> | <p>100% of reports will be complete within 60 days.</p> |
| <p>2010 (2010-2011)</p> | <p>100% of reports will be complete within 60 days.</p> |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Early Start will continue to offer prompt investigations to children and families. DDS will continuously monitor the process by use of a tracking system. Any variance will be noted and corrected.

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Please refer to overview of SPP development on page 1.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 11: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.

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

Measurement:

Percent equals (3.2(a) plus 3.2(b)) divided by (3.2) times 100.

Measurement:

Percent equals (number of decisions within timeline {30 day/Part C 45 day/Part B 45 day} plus number of decisions within extended timeline) divided by total number of hearings (fully adjudicated) times 100.

CALIFORNIA'S RESPONSE

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

All participants in the Early Start Program are informed of their right to undertake a due process proceeding if they are unable to reach agreement with the regional center or LEA about the substance of the family's program. DDS contracts with the OAH to provide an impartial adjudication of these issues. OAH provides DDS with the results of the hearings and formal mediation agreements and data on the numbers cases pending, resolved and dismissed.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The current data indicates that due process hearing requests are adjudicated within the 30 day timeline 100 percent of the time (measurement formula: 16 plus 0, divided by 16 times 100 equals 100 percent.)

Discussion of Baseline Data:

DDS has an excellent working arrangement with OAH and the performance of the requirements of this process has been excellent. A high level of quality and performance can be expected in the future.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|----------------------------|---|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 100% of cases will be adjudicated within the 30-day timeline. |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 100% of cases will be adjudicated within the 30-day timeline. |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 100% of cases will be adjudicated within the 30-day timeline. |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 100% of cases will be adjudicated within the 30-day timeline. |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 100% of cases will be adjudicated within the 30-day timeline. |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 100% of cases will be adjudicated within the 30-day timeline. |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

In OSEP's September 30, 2005, letter to DDS, California was directed to address plans in the SPP to improve performance in this area. The OSEP letter was in response to the State's April 19, 2005, submission of the Federal Fiscal Year 2003 Annual Performance Report. Specifically, the State was directed to ensure compliance with the requirement that not later than 30 days after the receipt of a parent's complaint, the impartial proceeding required under this subpart is completed and a written decision mailed to each of the parties.

When the OAH receives a parent's complaint/filing for due process hearing, a mediation session and due process hearing are scheduled to be held within the 30 day timeline. Participation in the mediation is voluntary for parents. OAH may allow an extension to the 30 day timeline only when the justification for the extension is due to exceptional circumstances. Exceptional circumstances may include family illness, the family's absence from the geographical area or the family's request to secure evidence pertaining to the complaint. Exceptional circumstances do not include administrative delays by the regional center/LEA.

Early Start will continuously monitor the OAH contract to ensure that this current level of performance is maintained.

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

California does not use the State’s Part B due process procedures for the Part C program; therefore, this indicator does not apply.

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)

Measurement:
Percent equals 3.1(a) divided by (3.1) times 100.

Measurement:
Percent equals to number of settlement agreements divided by total number of resolution sessions times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process: Not applicable to California (NA).

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005): NA

Discussion of Baseline Data: NA

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | NA |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | NA |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | NA |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | NA |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | NA |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | NA |

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources: NA****Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

Please refer to overview of SPP development on page 1.

| |
|--|
| 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 equals (2.1(a) (i) plus 2.1(b) (i)) divided by (2.1) times 100.

Measurement:

Percent equals (number of mediations not related to due process plus number of mediation agreements) Divided by total number of mediations times 100.

CALIFORNIA'S RESPONSE**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

See Indicator 11 above, for the description of the process.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Baseline data indicates that 51.52 percent of mediations that were held resulted in an agreement (measurement formula: 17 plus 0, plus 0 divided by 33 times 100 percent equals 51.52 percent.)

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Of the 167 due process filings for this period, 104 were withdrawn subsequent to informal processes. The parties agreed prior to the scheduled formal mediation or due process hearing. Therefore, mediation was offered to the remaining 33 cases. Of these, 17 had formal mediation agreements and the remaining 16 were fully adjudicated in a due process hearing.

The ICC recommended setting the measurement for this indicator at 50 percent with the understanding that the lead agency will explore ways to probe individual cases to determine the reasons why a family withdraws their request for mediation/due process hearing in the majority of filings. With the baseline percentage of 51.52 percent, and considering the ICC's recommendation, DDS established a target of 55 percent for mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <p>2005 (2005-2006)</p> | <p>55% of mediations will result in agreements.</p> |
| <p>2006 (2006-2007)</p> | <p>55% of mediations will result in agreements.</p> |
| <p>2007 (2007-2008)</p> | <p>55% of mediations will result in agreements.</p> |
| <p>2008 (2008-2009)</p> | <p>55% of mediations will result in agreements.</p> |
| <p>2009 (2009-2010)</p> | <p>55% of mediations will result in agreements.</p> |
| <p>2010 (2010-2011)</p> | <p>55% of mediations will result in agreements.</p> |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

The Quality Service Delivery System Committee of the ICC in collaboration with DDS will monitor this indicator and continue to make recommendations to improve the state’s performance on this item, if needed. Every six months, DDS will present a data report to this group and include the progress towards the goal. When improvements are needed, the ICC will make recommendations to DDS for actions to improve performance on this indicator.

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

With existing data systems in place, California is exploring the phasing in of the California Developmental Disability Information System (CADDIS) that would become the repository for the source data for future reports.

| |
|--|
| Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision |
|--|

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

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

Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data, State performance plan, 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).

CALIFORNIA'S RESPONSE**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

California's Part C Lead Agency has had the opportunity to consult with the research and data experts to identify and construct the most valid and appropriate measures and measurement techniques and methods as part of the SPP development process. This advance process takes advantage of available resources and ensures that sufficient resources are available to meet deadlines. Given that the data and systems historically used for settings information are not available until October, new non-comparable methods are being developed in order to meet the new February 2006 reporting date.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

California submitted its data tables on or before the due dates in 2005.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

California is piloting and planning on a new data system (CADDIS) on a geographic basis. A portion of 2005-06 data and every year thereafter is expected to have some elements of non-comparability to available baseline measures. The new data system collects exit data eliminating the need to match files with the Part B Lead Agency, which has historically challenged California's Part C Lead Agency for timely reporting.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | Tables and APR will be accurate and submitted on time. |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | Tables and APR will be accurate and submitted on time. |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | Tables and APR will be accurate and submitted on time. |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | Tables and APR will be accurate and submitted on time. |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | Tables and APR will be accurate and submitted on time. |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | Tables and APR will be accurate and submitted on time. |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

DDS, as California’s Part C Lead Agency, continues to examine methods to improve both the accuracy and the timeliness of the data reporting. DDS awaits the promulgation of the draft Part C regulations to correctly align data collection and reporting with other methods to ensure compliance and timely reporting by all regions within California.

Considerable resources are being dedicated to testing and validation of the new data system designed to provide the majority of the data required for all performance indicators on the entire program population. The new system, CADDIS, is much faster than prior monthly processing batch systems. CADDIS will have concurrent, instantaneous updates of files and records at both the local and State levels.

Part C – SPP/APR Attachment 1 (Form)

Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Complaints, Mediations, Resolution Sessions, and Due Process Hearings

| SECTION A: Signed, written complaints | |
|---|-----|
| (1) Signed, written complaints total | |
| (1.1) Complaints with reports issued | 6 |
| (a) Reports with findings | 6 |
| (b) Reports within timeline | 5 |
| (c) Reports within extended timelines | 1 |
| (1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed | 0 |
| (1.3) Complaints pending | 0 |
| (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing | 0 |
| SECTION B: Mediation requests | |
| (2) Mediation requests total | 63 |
| (2.1) Mediations | |
| (a) Mediations related to due process | 33 |
| (i) Mediation agreements | 17 |
| (b) Mediations not related to due process | 0 |
| (i) Mediation agreements | 0 |
| (2.2) Mediations not held (including pending) | 30* |
| SECTION C: Hearing requests | |
| (3) Hearing requests total | 167 |
| (3.1) Resolution sessions | NA |
| (a) Settlement agreements | NA |
| (3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated) | 16 |
| (a) Decisions within timeline SELECT timeline used {30 day/Part C 45 day/Part B 45 day} | 16 |
| (b) Decisions within extended timeline | 0 |
| (3.3) Resolved without a hearing | 121 |

* Pending but within timeline.