

<p>Outcome: Initial IFSP’s will be written for eligible families within 45 days of referral</p>	<p>So that: children and families receive services in a timely manner</p>
<p>Strategy update from last quarter: Strategies for the last QIP were written in part due to the appearance of progress based on the October over 45 day report received 11/14/14 (this report showed 2 late IFSP’s due to system issues). The report received 2/7/15 showed there were 17 late IFSP’s due to system issues in October and similar numbers for November and December. We have revised the strategies based on the updated data.</p>	
<p>Explanation of Data Quarterly Data:</p> <p>Quarterly Data (Oct-Dec 14): 737/790, 93.3%</p> <p>93.3% represents a 2.7% decrease in compliance compared to the most recent previous quarter, and is lower than any of the previous four quarters: Oct-Dec 13=99.3% Jan-March 14=97.98% April-June 14=97.85% July-Sept 14=95.9%</p> <p>Data for this quarter indicate a negative trend. Further analysis of the issues of non-compliance showed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 23% (12/53) were due to the family re-scheduling the initial assessment. This is a 13% increase from last quarter, likely due to the holidays. The SPOE has been unable to accommodate re-scheduled assessments within the 45 day timeline since assessment teams came under SPOE’s in 2011. • 19% (10/53) were due to an IC/SC scheduling issue. This is a 30% decrease from last quarter, which we attribute to increased training on contact/closure guidelines. • 15% (8/53) were due to the family re-scheduling an intake or IFSP appointment coupled with the assessment being scheduled over three weeks out. This issue was not noted last quarter. 	<p>Strategies (Who is responsible/timeline/evaluation):</p> <p>If we hypothesize that the majority of delayed IFSP’s are a result of the assessment team schedule, then we need to work to address the limitations that prevent the AT from scheduling initial assessments in a timely manner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AT was short-staffed during most of the quarter, including the manager position. This quarter also included the Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays, which present additional scheduling challenges for both staff and families. We expect to be at full staff by mid-April 2015. • Clusters have been working with State staff since 2011 to address AT limitations and coverage issues that have been challenging statewide. The statewide cluster workgroup recently sent proposals addressing coverage limitations to local agencies for feedback per state request, and plan to present these proposals to State staff in April 2015. Acceptance of these proposals would help alleviate the scheduling issues that contribute to late IFSP’s. <p>If we hypothesize that a significant number of delayed IFSP’s are a result of IC/SC scheduling delays, we should provide additional supervision and support to IC/SC’s to address scheduling challenges.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IC supervisor will increase supervision efforts beginning in March 2015, specifically reviewing completed and in process files to ensure scheduling timelines are followed • SPOE management staff will evaluate options for utilizing the

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15% (8/53) were due to families’ limited schedules. This issue was not noted last quarter, and we suspect this issue was also a related to the holidays. • 11% (6/53) were due to insufficient IC/SC documentation of an exceptional family circumstance (EFC). In all six cases, it appears there were EFC’s, but the state provided feedback that the documentation was insufficient to make that determination. This is a 9% increase from last quarter, possibly due to updated state guidelines pertaining to EFC’s (see below). • 6% (3/53) were due to cost participation related issues. This is a 40% decrease from last quarter, most likely due to increased IC/SC training on this issue. • 4% (2/53) were due to family requested delays. This issue has not been noted previously, as these would previously have been determined exceptional family circumstances. However, this quarter the state determined family requested delays must result in record closure, and if the record is not closed, it will be determined to be a system issue. • 2% (1/53) were due to the family canceling/re-scheduling two appointments. This issue has not been noted previously, as families missing two or more appointments during the intake period have previously been determined to be exceptional family circumstances. The SPOE is seeking additional clarification on this issue. • 2% (1/53) were due to waiting on a discipline specific assessment to determine eligibility. This is an 80% decrease from last quarter, likely due to increased IC/SC/ED team training on this issue. • There were two additional issues that were due to unusual, isolated circumstances. <p>In evaluating the data above, we determined that 40% (21/53) of the delayed IFSP’s were primarily attributed to the AT schedule (12 due to family requested assessment re-schedules that could not be</p>	<p>“children in 45 day timeline” report from iSPOE, and/or requesting other reports from state staff to identify children who are close to exceeding the 45 days in order to assist staff with problem solving before the timeline is missed (March 2015)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPOE management staff will review this issue with IC/SC’s, providing reminders and clarifications, at monthly staff meetings (beginning April 2015) <p>If we hypothesize that there is confusion about what constitutes an exceptional family circumstance, then we need to seek State clarification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPOE director will follow up with State staff regarding the guidelines provided on 3/4/15 to be sure we understand how EFC determinations will be made (March/April 2015) • Clarification will be provided to SPOE staff once SPOE managers fully understand the issue (April 2015)
--	--

<p>accommodated within the 45 days, 8 due to re-scheduled intakes/IFSP's coupled with the assessment being scheduled more than 3 weeks out, and one due to waiting for a discipline specific assessment to determine eligibility). We also determined that in 30% (16/53) of the instances of delayed IFSP's, the assessment was within 7 days of the IFSP due date. Scheduling this close to the due date gives SC's very limited options for scheduling the IFSP, and usually leaves no room for a family to re-schedule the IFSP meeting.</p> <p>It should also be noted that state determinations of what constitutes "exceptional family circumstances" last quarter appeared to be made differently than in previous quarters. Several SPOE's inquired about this after last quarter's determinations were received, and the State provided clarification on the guidelines they used. There were several this quarter that were determined to be system issues, but appeared to be documented exceptional family circumstances based on previous experience and the State's clarification guidelines. The SPOE will continue to work with State staff on this issue.</p>	
<p>List barriers to accomplishing strategies and how to address them:</p> <p>NA</p>	
<p>Resources needed:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Clarification <input type="checkbox"/> IIDC <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Mentoring <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p> <p>Explain: Explained above</p>	
<p>Stakeholder Collaboration: SPOE management staff reviewed preliminary report and discussed improvement strategies on 2/27/15; will review final report and detailed strategies on 3/26/15.</p>	