

Appendix A

Indicators and Measurements for Monitoring Regional Programs

**Indicators and Measurements for Monitoring Regional Programs
September 2007**

A. SPP/APR Indicators

Indicators	Data Sources		Indicator Measurement ¹	2007-2008 Target
	Data base	Other		
1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (SPP/APR Indicator #1)		Self assessment/ record review (hope to put into database) (OSEP requires data to be taken from monitoring or State Data System)	Programs will use a random sample of children’s records to complete their self assessment to respond to this indicator. Data must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Include the State’s criteria for “timely” receipt of early intervention services, i.e., time period from parent consent to IFSP services initiation date. 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.	100%
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children. (SPP/APR Indicator #2)	618 Settings Data		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.	
3-1. Percent of infant and toddlers who have completed Child Outcomes Summary Forms: A. Near entry; B. Near exit for those who were in program at least 6 months; and C. That are high quality with ratings that		COSF - to be on the Citrix server (OSEP permits state to select data source)	Measurement: 3-1 State reviews data entered to determine if all children in a given program have completed initial and exit COSFs, as appropriate. A. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers who entered the program at 30 months or younger for whom an initial COSF was completed) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers who entered the program)] times 100. B. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers who exited the program after at least 6 months of service for whom an exit COSF was completed, provided an entry COSF was completed at entry) divided by the (total #	3-1 A - 100% 3-1 B - 100% 3-1 C - TBD by Stakeholders

¹ OSEP has made proposed changes to the Part C SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table, which are out for public comment. Once OSEP has finalized their revisions to the Part C SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table, modifications to the “Measurement” section of this table will be made for the SPP/APR indicators.

**Indicators and Measurements for Monitoring Regional Programs
September 2007**

A. SPP/APR Indicators

Indicators	Data Sources		Indicator Measurement ¹	2007-2008 Target
	Data base	Other		
<p>reflect child's functioning in the 3 outcome areas.</p> <p>3-2. 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. (SPP/APR Indicator #3)</p>			<p>of infants and toddlers who entered the program)] times 100.</p> <p>3-1 Programs will use a random sample of children's records to complete their self assessment to respond to indicator 3-1 (C).</p> <p>C. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers for whom a COSF was completed where the ratings are consistent with the evidence on the COSF and in the child's file) divided by the (total # of children sampled)] times 100.</p> <p>Note: Guidance will be provided on reviewing COSFs for high quality.</p> <p>3-2 State summarizes data to determine percent of children with IFSPs who have demonstrated improved outcomes.</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	N/A until 2010

**Indicators and Measurements for Monitoring Regional Programs
September 2007**

A. SPP/APR Indicators

Indicators	Data Sources		Indicator Measurement ¹	2007-2008 Target
	Data base	Other		
			<p>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.</p> <p>If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	

**Indicators and Measurements for Monitoring Regional Programs
September 2007**

A. SPP/APR Indicators

Indicators	Data Sources		Indicator Measurement ¹	2007-2008 Target
	Data base	Other		
			<p>If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.</p>	
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services		Family Survey - to be on the Citrix server but also can be	<p>State must clarify the data source in the State Performance Plan.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report</p>	

**Indicators and Measurements for Monitoring Regional Programs
September 2007**

A. SPP/APR Indicators

Indicators	Data Sources		Indicator Measurement ¹	2007-2008 Target
	Data base	Other		
<p>have helped the family: A. Know their rights; B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and C. Help their children develop and learn. (SPP/APR Indicator #4)</p>		<p>done hard copy and entered by state staff</p> <p>(OSEP permits states to select data source)</p>	<p>that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>4A - 93.75%</p> <p>4B - 93.75%</p> <p>4C - 93.35%</p>
<p>5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to state data. (this is a modified version of SPP/APR Indicator #5)</p>	618 data - Annual Report of Children Served		<p>Measurement:</p> <p>Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 in the region)] times 100</p>	2.1%
<p>6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to state data. (this is a modified version of SPP/APR Indicator #6)</p>	618 data - Annual Report of Children Served		<p>Measurement:</p> <p>Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 in the region)] times 100</p>	4.4%
<p>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.</p>	Appropriate field(s) in Data System (OSEP permits data to be taken from		<p>Data must address timeline from point of referral to initial IFSP meeting based on actual, not an average, number of days.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>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 the (# of eligible infants and</p>	100%

**Indicators and Measurements for Monitoring Regional Programs
September 2007**

A. SPP/APR Indicators

Indicators	Data Sources		Indicator Measurement ¹	2007-2008 Target
	Data base	Other		
(SPP/APR Indicator #7)	monitoring or State Data System)		toddlers evaluated and assessed)] times 100. Account for untimely evaluations.	
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. (SPP/APR Indicator #8)	Appropriate field(s) in Data System (OSEP requires data to be taken from monitoring or State data system)	Self assessment/ record review (for first part of this year and then will be in Data Base)	Programs will use a random sample of children's records to complete their self assessment to respond to this indicator. Measurement: A. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C)] times 100. 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.	100%
9. Percent of noncompliance findings that are corrected within one year by each component of the general supervision system (desk audit, self-assessment, complaints, hearings, onsite monitoring visits). (this is a modified version of SPP/APR		State monitoring/CAP tracking log (regions monitored and any with CAP) (OSEP requires data to be taken from State monitoring,	The state determines for each program the percent of findings of noncompliance by desk audit, self-assessment, complaints, hearings, and onsite monitoring visits that were corrected in a timely manner. (The state is required to report in the SPP/APR the number of EIS programs monitored using different components of the State's general supervision system.) 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	100%

**Indicators and Measurements for Monitoring Regional Programs
September 2007**

A. SPP/APR Indicators

Indicators	Data Sources		Indicator Measurement ¹	2007-2008 Target
	Data base	Other		
Indicator #9)		complaints, hearings and other general supervision system components)	<p>than one year from identification.</p> <p>Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.</p> <p>For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement, that the State has taken.</p>	
<p>10. Percent of regional program reported data (child count and exiting data, monthly data entry, contract submission requirements, CAPs, etc.) that are timely. (this is a modified version of SPP/APR Indicator #14)</p>		State tracking log for data and report submission	<p>Measurement (Locals report to State):</p> <p>Local reported data are submitted on or before due dates :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. June 30th Child Count and Exiting Data: <u>July 30th</u> 2. December 1st Child Count and Exiting Data: <u>December 10th</u> 3. Data Entry for Each Child's IFSPs: <u>previous month's data is entered by the 10th of each month</u> 4. <u>Personnel List: submitted annually with the contract and changes in personnel are submitted by the 10th of each month</u> 5. <u>Regional Contract Submission Requirements: June 30th</u> 6. <u>Self-Assessment Data: June 30th</u> 7. <u>Corrective Action Plans: 30 days after receipt of written identification of noncompliance by the state following onsite visit, findings from complaint investigations, etc.</u> 8. <u>Corrective Action Plan Progress Reports: as specified in each CAP's evidence of change statement (specified by the state)</u> 9. <u>Child Outcomes Summary Forms: COSF is entered within 30 days after the COSF is completed; state staff check web entries quarterly</u> 10. <u>Family Surveys: July 30th, October 30th, January 30th, April 30th</u> <p>Measurement (State reports to OSEP):</p> <p>State reported data, including 618 data, State performance plan, and annual performance reports, are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, settings and November 1 for exiting, personnel, dispute resolution); and b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring error free, consistent, 	100%

**Indicators and Measurements for Monitoring Regional Programs
September 2007**

A. SPP/APR Indicators

Indicators	Data Sources		Indicator Measurement ¹	2007-2008 Target
	Data base	Other		
			valid and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met). Percent = [(# of reported data submitted on or before due date) divided by the (# of reported data to be submitted)] times 100	

**Indicators and Measurements for Monitoring Regional Programs
September 2007**

B. State Selected Priority Indicators

Indicators	Data Sources		Indicator Measurement	Target
	Data Base	Other		
<p>11. Percent of children's evaluations/assessments that are:</p> <p>A. Conducted by qualified personnel;</p> <p>B. Completed in all developmental areas, including vision and hearing.</p>	<p>Appropriate field(s) in Data System for 11 A</p>	<p>Self assessment/ record review for 11B</p>	<p>Measurement:</p> <p>A. Programs enter name and credentials of each evaluator who conducted child evaluation/assessment in data base. State compares names/credentials with personnel/contractor list submitted by program as part of contract. (This comparison could possibly be done automatically if name of evaluator and credentials of all personnel/contractors of each program are housed in the Citrix Server. If this comparison needs to be done manually, a sample should be used rather than an analysis on all children.)</p> <p>Percent = # of children for whom evaluation/assessments were performed by evaluators who are qualified to conduct evaluations and assessments divided by all children who received evaluations/assessments provided during the FY (or the number of children sampled).</p> <p>B. Programs will use a random sample of children's records to complete their self assessments to respond to this indicator. Programs develop an evaluation and assessment report reflecting that all developmental areas (Expressive Language, Receptive Language, Gross Motor, Fine Motor, Cognitive, Social-Emotional, Adaptive, Hearing, Vision, Health) were assessed. Programs review evaluation and assessment reports (and tools used) to determine if all developmental areas were actually assessed.</p> <p>Percent = # of children with evaluation/assessment reports that include data/information on the child's development in each area divided by the total number of records reviewed for children who have received evaluations/assessments.</p> <p>Note: Guidance will be provided on what information should be included in the evaluation of Health.</p>	<p>100%</p>
<p>12. Percent of children whose parents received</p>	<p>Appropriate field(s) in</p>	<p>Self assessment /</p>	<p>Measurement (Current)</p>	<p>100%</p>

**Indicators and Measurements for Monitoring Regional Programs
September 2007**

B. State Selected Priority Indicators

Indicators	Data Sources		Indicator Measurement	Target
	Data Base	Other		
<p>procedural safeguards at the appropriate times including: A. Written prior notice before proposing or refusing to initiate or change the identification, evaluation, or placement of the child or the provision of EI services to the child and family, B. Consent prior to conducting the evaluation and assessment, and C. Consent prior to providing IFSP services.</p>	<p>Data System for 12C</p>	<p>record review for 12A & 12B</p> <p>Eventually add all dates for the forms in A, B and C plus dates for the all "actions requiring PWN, evaluation and assessment, and provision of IFSP services to the database.</p>	<p>A. Programs will use a random sample of children's records to complete their self assessments to respond to this indicator. The date on the copy of the written prior notice form is compared with the date of each action requiring prior notice (e.g., prior to screening and evaluation/assessment, following screening if evaluation/assessment will not be provided, at eligibility determination, prior to IFSP meetings and providing IFSP services) to ensure the notice is provided at appropriate times.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Percent = # of children where the date that prior written notice was provided is before the date of each action where notice is required divided by the total number of records sampled.</p> <p>B. Programs will use a random sample of children's records to complete their self assessments to respond to this indicator. The date on the copy of the most recent consent for evaluation/assessment is compared with the date of those evaluations/assessments that are provided to determine if consent was provided prior to the action.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Percent = # of children where the date of consent for evaluation/assessment is before the date of each evaluation/assessment conducted divided by the total number of records sampled.</p> <p>C. Programs enter the date of parent signature on the IFSP when they give consent for the provision of services. The state compares the date of parent consent with the date each service is first provided (see data collected in Indicator #1).</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Percent = # of children where the date of consent for IFSP services (parent signature on IFSP) is before the date of the provision of services divided by the total number of children with one or more services provided.</p> <p>Future Measurement (if data is in data system):</p> <p>A. Programs enter the date that each prior notice form was provided to</p>	

**Indicators and Measurements for Monitoring Regional Programs
September 2007**

B. State Selected Priority Indicators

Indicators	Data Sources		Indicator Measurement	Target
	Data Base	Other		
			<p>the family and the dates that screening, evaluation and assessment, eligibility determination, and IFSP meetings were completed.</p> <p>Percent = # of children where the date that prior written notice was provided is before the date of each action where notice is required divided by the total number of children where any action was taken.</p> <p>B. Programs enter the date the parent signed the consent for evaluation and assessment form and the date that evaluations and assessments were completed.</p> <p>Percent = # of children where the date of consent for evaluation/assessment is before the date of each evaluation/assessment conducted divided by the total number of children with one or more evaluations/ assessments conducted.</p>	
<p>13. Percent of children for whom services are provided: A. As outlined on the IFSP, and B. By qualified personnel.</p>		<p>Self assessment/ record review</p>	<p>Programs will use a random sample of children's records to complete their self assessments to respond to this indicator.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>A. Programs compare the service notes with the IFSP to see if the services are being provided as outlined on the IFSP.</p> <p>Percent = # of children where the services are being provided as outlined on the IFSP divided by the total number of records sampled.</p> <p>B. Programs compare the names/credentials of personnel providing services as documented in service notes with the personnel/contractor list submitted by the program with the contract.</p> <p>Percent = # of children for whom services were provided by staff qualified to conduct those services divided by the number of records reviewed (or all children who had services provided during the FY).</p>	<p>100%</p>
<p>14. Percent of children who</p>	<p>Appropriate</p>		<p>Measurement:</p>	<p>100%</p>

**Indicators and Measurements for Monitoring Regional Programs
September 2007**

B. State Selected Priority Indicators

Indicators	Data Sources		Indicator Measurement	Target
	Data Base	Other		
received timely IFSP meetings: A. 6 month reviews, and B. Annual IFSP evaluation.	field(s) in Data System		<p>Programs enter the date that IFSP reviews and annual IFSP meetings are held for each child. Programs also enter the reason for the delay of the IFSP meeting if it is beyond the required deadline. The state compares the date that the IFSP reviews and annual IFSP meetings are held with the required deadlines for completion of these meetings to determine if timelines have been met. Those children whose IFSP meetings were delayed as a result of exceptional family circumstances are not included in the calculations.</p> <p>A. percent = number of children where the date of 6 month IFSP review is within 6 months of the initial IFSP divided by the total number of IFSPs with 6 month reviews.</p> <p>B. percent = number of children where the date of annual IFSP review is within 12 months of the initial IFSP divided by the total number of IFSPs with annual reviews.</p> <p>Note: Other reasons for the delay in timely IFSP meetings are important for investigating root causes and should be used for developing CAPs but are NOT reported in this calculation.</p>	
15. Percent of children whose IFSP includes: A. Outcomes that are measurable; B. Outcomes that are related to family priorities, concerns and resources; C. Outcomes that are functional and reflect the child and family's every day routines and activities; and D. Strategies/activities designed to support the capacity of the family to		Self assessment / record review	<p>Programs will use a random sample of children's records to complete their self assessment to respond to this indicator.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>Programs review the most recent IFSP to determine if:</p> <p>A. IFSP outcomes are measurable.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Percent = # of IFSPs that have outcomes that are measurable divided by total number of records reviewed.</p> <p>B. IFSP outcomes are related to family priorities, concerns and resources.</p>	<p>15a - 100%</p> <p>15b - 80%</p> <p>15c - 80%</p> <p>15d - 85%</p>

**Indicators and Measurements for Monitoring Regional Programs
September 2007**

B. State Selected Priority Indicators

Indicators	Data Sources		Indicator Measurement	Target
	Data Base	Other		
enhance the child's development.			<p>Percent = #of IFSPs that have outcomes that are related to family priorities, concerns and resources divided by total number of records reviewed.</p> <p>C. IFSP outcomes are functional and reflect the child and family's every day routines and activities.</p> <p>Percent = # of IFSPs that have outcomes that are functional and reflect the child and family's every day routines and activities divided by total number of records reviewed.</p> <p>D. IFSP strategies/activities are designed to support the capacity of the family to enhance the child's development.</p> <p>Percent = # of IFSPs that have strategies/activities designed to support the capacity of the family to enhance the child's development divided by total number of records reviewed.</p> <p>Note: Guidance around how to determine if outcomes are measurable, functional, related to family's CPRs, and if strategies/activities support the capacity of the family to enhance the child's development, will be included in instructions on the self-assessment/record review.</p>	
<p>16. Percent of children whose IFSPs include a statement/ description of the child's developmental status in all areas including:</p> <p>A. The child's functional skills (in each area), and</p> <p>B. The child's developmental levels (in each area)</p>	Appropriate field(s) in Data System		<p>Measurement:</p> <p>Programs enter information about each child's functional skills and developmental levels in the data base. The state reviews a sample of IFSPs from the data base to determine if the IFSP includes information on the child's functional skills and development levels for each developmental area (Expressive Language, Receptive Language, Gross Motor, Fine Motor, Cognitive, Social-Emotional, Adaptive, Hearing, Vision, Health).</p> <p>A. Percent = # of children whose IFSPs include a statement/description of the child's developmental levels in each</p>	<p>16a - 80%</p> <p>16b- 100%</p>

**Indicators and Measurements for Monitoring Regional Programs
September 2007**

B. State Selected Priority Indicators

Indicators	Data Sources		Indicator Measurement	Target
	Data Base	Other		
			<p>area (Expressive Language, Receptive Language, Gross Motor, Fine Motor, Cognitive, Social-Emotional, Adaptive, Hearing, Vision, Health) divided by the total number of IFSPs sampled.</p> <p>B. Percent = # of children whose IFSPs includes a statement/description of the child's functional skills in each area (Expressive Language, Receptive Language, Gross Motor, Fine Motor, Cognitive, Social-Emotional, Adaptive, Hearing, Vision, Health) divided by the total number of IFSPs sampled.</p> <p>Note: Guidance will be provided on information that should be included in the IFSP regarding health, especially the use information regarding health status as reported by the physician and the child's parents/caregivers.</p>	
17. Percent of children whose eligibility determinations included the use of clinical opinion.		<p>Self assessment / record review</p> <p>(Eventually add to data base as part of the IFSP)</p>	<p>Programs will use a random sample of children's records to complete their self assessments to respond to this indicator.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>Evaluation and assessment reports (Multidisciplinary Team reports) and eligibility statements are reviewed to determine if informed clinical opinion was used to determine eligibility.</p> <p>Percent = # of children with MDT reports and/or eligibility statements that indicate clinical opinion was used to determine eligibility divided by the total number of records sampled (or number of all children whose eligibility was determined during the FY).</p> <p>Note: Guidance on use of informed clinical opinion will be provided.</p>	100%

**Indicators and Measurements for Monitoring Regional Programs
September 2007**

C. State Selected Priority Indicators through Contract Management

Indicators	Data Source		Indicator Measurement	Target
	Data Base	Other		
18. Percent of personnel employed by program and their contractors that meet state personnel standards/qualifications.		<p>Report from programs 1x/year as part of contract</p> <p>Maybe add a table to Citrix about personnel with the requirement that programs update the data monthly as personnel/contractors change</p>	<p>Programs submit annually, as part of their contract with the state, a list of personnel employed and their contractors with their credentials and a list of services they are qualified to provide. Programs will also update personnel/contractor information in the data base (when available) on a monthly basis as personnel/contracts change.</p> <p>Percent = # programs that employ personnel or contract with providers who meet the state personnel standards/qualifications divided by total number programs</p> <p>Note: Personnel qualifications reported to the state will be verified during onsite visits by randomly selecting personnel files of personnel employed as well as contractors, to compare information in the personnel file with the list of personnel qualifications submitted to the state.</p>	100%