

ANNUAL REPORT CERTIFICATION OF THE INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COUNCIL UNDER PART C OF THE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT (IDEA)

Under IDEA Section 641(e)(1)(D) and 34 CFR §303.654, the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) of each jurisdiction that receives funds under Part C of the IDEA must prepare and submit to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education (Department) and to the Governor of its jurisdiction an annual report on the status of the early intervention programs for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families operated within the State. The ICC may either: (1) prepare and submit its own annual report to the Department and the Governor, or (2) provide this certification with the State lead agency's Annual Performance Report (APR)¹ under Part C of the IDEA. This certification (including the annual report or APR) is due no later than February 1, 2012.

On behalf of the ICC of the State/jurisdiction of Connecticut, I hereby certify that the ICC is: [please check one]

- 1. [] Submitting its own annual report (which is attached); or
2. [x] Using the State's Part C APR for FFY 2010 in lieu of submitting the ICC's own annual report. By completing this certification, the ICC confirms that it has reviewed the State's Part C APR for accuracy and completeness.²

I hereby further confirm that a copy of this Annual Report Certification and the annual report or APR has been provided to our Governor.

Handwritten signature of ICC Chairperson over a line, with the text 'Signature of ICC Chairperson' below.

Handwritten date '12/12/11' over a line, with the text 'Date' below.

Handwritten email 'MGreens@ccmc-kids.org' over a line, with 'Address or e-mail' below.
Handwritten phone number '860-545-9000 (Page Me)' over a line, with 'Daytime telephone number' below.

1 Under IDEA Sections 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(II) and 642 and under 34 CFR §80.40, the lead agency's APR must report on the State's performance under its State performance plan and contain information about the activities and accomplishments of the grant period for a particular Federal fiscal year (FFY).

2 If the ICC is using the State's Part C APR and it disagrees with data or other information presented in the State's Part C APR, the ICC must attach to this certification an explanation of the ICC's disagreement and submit the certification and explanation no later than February 1, 2012.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010

Throughout this document years are represented as '10-'11 representing the calendar year of July 1 of the first year ('10) to June 30 of the last year ('11) regardless of the federal fiscal year.

1	Infants and toddlers receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.	p. 3
2	Infants and toddlers primarily receive early intervention services in the home or in programs for typically developing children.	p. 7
3a	Infants and toddlers demonstrate improved: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships).	p. 9
3b	Infants and toddlers demonstrate improved: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication).	
3c	Infants and toddlers demonstrate improved: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.	
4a	Families participating in Part C report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights.	p. 13
4b	Families participating in Part C report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs.	
4c	Families participating in Part C report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn.	
5a&b	The percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1.	p. 16
6a&b	The percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3.	p. 17
7	Families of infants and toddlers referred to Birth to Three have an evaluation / assessment and an initial IFSP meeting within 45 days.	p. 18
8a	All children exiting Part C receive timely transition planning including IFSPs with transition steps and services.	p. 21
8b	Notification to LEA of all children exiting Part C, if child potentially eligible for Part B.	p.23
8c	All children exiting Part C receive timely transition conferences, if child potentially eligible for Part B.	p.25
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. (Attachment A [a.k.a. 1] is on page 37)	p. 28
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.	p. 32
11	Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.	p. 33
12	Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions (Not-applicable for Part C in Connecticut).	p. 34
13	Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.	p. 35
14	State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. (Attachment B is on page 40)	p. 36

NOTE: If viewing this electronically, each indicator above is a hyperlink to a bookmark. To move between indicators type **Ctrl + g** and then type **ind#** or **att#** where # is the indicator number. In addition, other blue text in the document is often an external link to related files such the [Public Reporting](#) tables posted on www.birth23.org. Connecticut recently updated its web site and external links in older SPP/APR files may fail. All the related files are now located on www.birth23.org under the menu option that reads "How are we doing?".

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for the 2010-2011 Year

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

An overview of the proposed APR and the revised [State Performance Plan \(SPP\)](#) was presented at an ICC meeting on December 12, 2011. Notification was also given to the PTI and Connecticut’s Family Support Council. An ICC subcommittee then discussed further edits during a webinar on January 9, 2012. The final draft was posted on www.Birth23.org on January 10, 2012. All early intervention programs and parent groups were notified about the updated APR and SPP through the biweekly electronic Birth to Three Provider Newsletter.

In addition to having Connecticut stakeholders review and revise the draft APR, the lead agency received helpful reviews from the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC)/Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO), the North East Regional Resource Center (NERRC) as well as staff from the Data and Accountability Center (DAC).

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 1: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services, including the reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
7/1/10-6/30/11	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:

99%

Using its statewide data system, Connecticut reviewed service data for ALL children with Individual Family Service Plans (IFSPs) on 12/1/10 that had at least one new service listed on the IFSP in effect on 12/1/10. As for indicators 2, 5, and 6, a point in time was used for this indicator and is representative of the reporting period. All missing and late first services were identified to programs, the data were verified via email exchanges and faxes, and once noncompliance was confirmed, letters were mailed to programs identifying the findings.

Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive Early Intervention Services in a Timely Manner:

a. Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received the new early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	1892
b. Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received the new services on their IFSPs late due to a documented exceptional family circumstance	106
c. Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs that had at least one new service.	2014
Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner (Percent = [(a)+(b)] divided by (c) times 100)	99%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

On 12/1/10 there were 4499 children with IFSPs in Part C. 2014 of those children had at least one NEW service listed on their IFSP that was in effect on 12/1/10. 1892 children received all new services in a timely manner (within 45 days from parent consent). An additional 106 children received the service(s) late due to a documented exceptional family circumstance beyond the control of the lead agency. The 106 were added to the numerator for a total of 1998 and kept in the denominator (2014).

While Connecticut did not reach its target, the state continues to maintain a high level of compliance since the '05-'06 year (baseline 97%), the '06-'07 year (97%), the '07-'08 year (98%), the '08-'09 year (99%), and the '09-'10 year (99%).

There were only 16 children with at least one late service not due to documented extraordinary family circumstances that were beyond the control of the lead agency.

The breakout by reason with ranges in days includes:

- 15 – due to program errors such as misunderstanding that it is not 45 days from the projected start date on the plan, scheduling errors on the part of staff, and a lack of documentation about the reasons for the delays. (Range 48 – 112 days),
- 1 – due to challenges faced in obtaining the child’s primary physician’s signature on the IFSP which is required in CT before new services can begin (two services 50-57 days)

Since the date of each first service and the reason any were late is known for each child, Connecticut has ensured that the families of all 16 children who did not receive the new service(s) on their IFSPs within timelines ultimately received all required services. Although timeline-related child-specific noncompliance reported for this indicator cannot be corrected retroactively, Connecticut has verified that noncompliance was corrected by ensuring that any missing services were provided if the family was still in Birth to Three and that subsequent practice (a minimum of three consecutive months) reflected sustained 100% correction of noncompliance. The state's efforts to verify correction of noncompliance by reviewing updated data to ensure that programs were correctly implementing the requirements and to prevent future noncompliance are described below.

APR Template – Part C (4)

Connecticut
State

During the '10-'11 year, Connecticut had 44 comprehensive programs. The 16 children with at least one late service (not due to documented extraordinary family circumstances) were enrolled in 8 different programs. Findings were issued to 7 of the 8 programs based on the APR data with correction due in the '11-'12 year. Connecticut will report on the correction of those findings in the '11-'12 APR, due February 1, 2013. The remaining program was not issued a new finding because the program had already been issued a finding about this measure during the '10-'11 year.

Correction of '09-'10 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for '09-'10 for this indicator: 99%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY09 (the period from July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010)	6
2. Number of '09-'10 findings the State verified as timely corrected (verified as corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	5
3. Number of '09-'10 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	1

Correction of '09-'10 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

4. Number of '09-'10 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	1
5. Number of '09-'10 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	1
6. Number of '09-'10 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Verification of Correction of FFY 2009 noncompliance or FFY 2009 findings (either timely or subsequent):

The state verified timely correction for five programs about this one measure (range 3-11 months).

There was one program for which correction of a finding about providing new services in a timely manner could not be completed within one year from identification. This is a measure that has a timeline for completion and the lead agency was able to verify that there were no eligible children with undelivered new services when the finding was made. Using subsequent data, the lead agency was unable to verify correction by September 30, 2010 which was one year from identification (September 30, 2009). As a result a corrective action plan was developed with the program, sanctions were imposed, and the required actions were tracked. Subsequent correction was ultimately verified as of November 2, 2011 (25 months after identification).

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in the '09-'10 year:

The state verified the correction of all systemic and child-specific noncompliance using a combination of onsite verification visits, reports from the statewide database, emails with providers, and the secure faxing of backup documentation from the early intervention record at the local program. In its '09-'10 APR, Connecticut accounted for all instances of noncompliance with the timely service provisions identified through the review of database data and other monitoring procedures. As required, Connecticut identified each of the programs with noncompliance and notified them of the measure, the statutory reference, the raw scores, and the percent. Programs were required to determine the root cause of the noncompliance and revise policies, procedures and practices that resulted in noncompliance as appropriate. Once correction was reported, at least three months of subsequent data were reviewed that demonstrated 100% compliance with the timely service provision requirements.

Through this combination of efforts, the lead agency verified that each program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 has initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the Birth to Three program, and is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, based on a review of subsequent data, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
<p>"If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary."</p>	<p>The lead agency found that the noncompliance during the '10-'11 year was very limited (16 / 2014) and often due to human error. Programs were reminded using a bi-weekly newsletter about using reports from the database to track the timely delivery of new services.</p>

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for the '11-'12 year (if applicable):

No revisions at this time. There is no outstanding correction of identified child-specific or systemic noncompliance. The lead agency will continue to use a variety of methods to ensure that all new services are provided in a timely manner.

[Public Reporting of APR Data](#) (direct link)

For each program, the APR data about this indicator will be posted by February 28, 2012 on Birth23.org under "How Are We Doing?"

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Same process as described in Indicator #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 community-based settings. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

FFY10	Measurable and Rigorous Target
7/1/10-6/30/11	95%

Actual Target Data for FFY10 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011):

The information below is taken from the 618 setting tables submitted for children with IFSPs on December 1, 2010.

Primary Setting of Infants and Toddlers, Ages Birth Through 2	
(4395 + 100) / 4499 = 99%	
Total (Rows 1-3)	4499
1. Home	4395
2. Community-Based Settings	100
3. Other Settings	4

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY10 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011):

Connecticut maintains a high percentage since the '04-'05 year (baseline 99%), the '05-'06 year (99%), the '06-'07 year (99%), the '08-'09 year (99%), and the '09-'10 year (99%).

Data Verification

A data verification visit was completed in September of 2009 and a finding of noncompliance based on requirements related to this indicator (missing justifications in the IFSP) was made. The child-specific noncompliance was verified as corrected within two weeks based on confidential faxes to the lead agency of the new IFSPs with justification pages. Sustained correction was verified based on an onsite verification visit in August 2010. This finding is included in Indicator 9.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY11 (July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012) [If applicable]

No revisions at this time. There is no outstanding correction of identified child-specific or systemic noncompliance. The lead agency will continue to use a variety of methods to ensure that each child who receives any service in a setting other than home or a community setting for typical peers has the justification included in the family's IFSP.

[Public Reporting of APR Data](#) (direct link)

For each program, the APR data about this indicator will be posted by February 28, 2012 on Birth23.org under "How Are We Doing?".

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Same process as described in Indicator #1.

ECO Suggested Format

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

Measurement:

Outcomes:

- 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.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes (use for FFY 2010-2011 reporting):

Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

Percent = # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in category (d) divided by [# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d)] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2:
Percent = # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus [# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e) divided by the total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.

Target Data and Actual Target Data for FFY2010 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011):
Out of 4903 children who exited in the '10-'11 year, 3223 had at least six months between their first service and exit date. Two sets of Child Outcome Summary Form (COSF) scores were entered for 2816 (87%) of the 3223 children. *This is a 10% increase from the '09-'10 year.* The entry and exit scores for each child plus a response to the Child Outcome Summary (COS) form question about whether any new skills had been acquired are used to determine the five progress categories listed in the Measurement box above and on the next page. The five progress categories are then used for the two summary statements below.

Summary Statements	Actual '09-'10 (% and # children)	Actual '10-'11 (% and # children)	Targets '10-'11 (% children)
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)			
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Formula: c+d/ a+b+c+d (2058/2476)	84.7% (n=2180)	83.1% (n=2476)	84.7%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program. Formula: d+e/ a+b+c+d+e (1567/2816)	51.2% (n=2441)	55.6% (n=2816)	51.2%
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)			
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Formula: c+d/ a+b+c+d (2183/2623)	88.0% (n=2266)	83.2% (n=2623)	88.0%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they exited the program. Formula: d+e/ a+b+c+d+e (1455/2816)	53.8% (n=2441)	51.7% (n=2816)	53.8%
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs			
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Formula: c+d/ a+b+c+d (2234/2515)	88.5% (n=2285)	88.8% (n=2515)	88.5%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they exited the program. Formula: d+e/ a+b+c+d+e (1792/2816)	53.2% (n=2441)	63.6% (n=2816)	53.2%

APR Template – Part C (4)

Connecticut
State

These are the progress categories for each Outcome for children who exited in the '10-'11 year.

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Children who did not improve functioning	29	1%
b. Children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers	389	14%
c. Children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	831	29%
d. Children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1227	44%
e. Children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	340	12%
Total	N=2816	100%

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Children who did not improve functioning	30	1%
b. Children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers	410	14%
c. Children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	921	33%
d. Children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1262	45%
e. Children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	193	7%
Total	N=2816	100%

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Children who did not improve functioning	23	1%
b. Children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers	258	9%
c. Children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	743	26%
d. Children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1491	53%
e. Children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	301	11%
Total	N=2816	100%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY10 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011):

Connecticut revised its targets in the State Performance Plan submitted on February 1, 2011 and those changes were accepted by OSEP. The state met its new target for three of the six summary statements A2, C1, and C2. The results for summary statements A1, B1 and B2 did not meet the state target.

It is highly likely that the 10% increase in the “participation rate” (percent of children with two sets of scores exiting with at least six months of service / children exiting with at least six months of service who exited at age three or due to no longer needing Part C) was related to public reporting of this percent by program on the Birth to Three website, combined with emails to programs with low rates. When available, Connecticut does include data about children in families who move, who withdraw from Part C, and who the program is unable to locate for reporting on this indicator. Those records are not used in the calculation of the participation rate by program because there are a number of variable impacting why exit ratings may not be completed with families who leave Birth to Three for those reasons.

After a pilot period and providing training, the state required that all programs use a new form that combined the ECO Center Decision Tree with the Child Outcome Summary (COS) form effective 7/1/10. Some children exiting in '10-'11 had a different form at entry than at exit.

Connecticut continues to analyze the quality of its data and actively participates on ECO Center COSF Community of Practice calls whenever possible. At the September 2011 ECO Conference, Connecticut helped lead a pre-conference workshop about sharing and analyzing child and family outcome data.

Self-Assessment

One program reported in a self assessment that they were not consistently collecting and entering child outcome data. This was verified as corrected based on data reports that demonstrate an increase from 76% to 83% of children in that program for at least six months with two sets of COS scores in the data system which is within the state’s expected range. This finding is included in the Indicator 9 worksheet.

Focused Monitoring

Part C stakeholders selected child outcome data as one part of the focused monitoring program selection process. One program was selected for a visit during the '10-'11 year because for this program the results for Summary Statement 1 ("substantially increased their rate of growth") for Outcome 2 (acquisition and use of knowledge and skills including early language/ communication) were at least 2 standard deviations below the mean as compared to other small programs. It was an Autism Specific program and the summary of the visit is available on www.birth23.org under “How Are We Doing?” > Focused Monitoring > First Partners.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY10 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011) [If applicable]

Public Reporting of APR Data (direct link)

For each program, the APR data about this indicator will be posted in February 2012 on Birth23.org under “How Are We Doing?”.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Same process as described in Indicator #1.

ECO Suggested Format

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments
<p>Indicator 4: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Know their rights; B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and C. Help their children develop and learn. <p>(20 USC 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)</p>

<p>Measurement:</p> <p>A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.</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>
--

FFY10	Measurable and Rigorous Target
7/1/10-6/30/11	4a) 83% 4b) 80% 4c) 91%

Actual Target Data for FFY10 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011):

FY08 Family Outcome	N=947
4A (know my rights)	87.9% (833)
CI at 95%CL	85.9% - 90.0%
SD / Standard Error	32.6% / 1.1%
4B (communicate about my child)	86.3% (817)
CI at 95%CL	84.1% - 88.5%
SD / Standard Error	34.4% / 1.1%
4C (help me help my child)	94.7% (897)
CI at 95%CL	93.3% - 96.2%
SD / Standard Error	22.4% / 0.7%

Connecticut met its targets on all three outcomes. Progress was demonstrated as compared to FY10 results (84% for 4A, 82% for 4B, and 91% for 4C). This increase held true even when the two years were compared after eliminating the cases with extreme scores (surveys where “very strongly agree” was selected for each item). Using a census model and the same method for delivering and obtaining the surveys as last year (in person), 2001 surveys were given out and 952 surveys were returned. This return rate of 48% is similar to previous years. Of the 952 returned, 947 were complete enough to be usable in a Rasch analysis.

The response pool was determined to be representative when compared by race/ ethnicity and gender to the census and the 12/1/10 Table 1 from Section 618 of IDEA:

	Section 618 of IDEA Table 1		Surveys Sent Out Using Census		Survey Response Pool	
	4499	12/1/2010	2001	2/1/2011	952	9/1/2011
Total	4499	12/1/2010	2001	2/1/2011	952	9/1/2011
1. HISPANIC/LATINO	1309	29%	598	30%	292	31%
2. AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKA NATIVE	14	0%	4	0%	3	0%
3. ASIAN	131	3%	49	2%	22	2%
4. BLACK OR AFRICAN AMERICAN	518	12%	242	12%	110	12%
5. NATIVE HAWAIIAN OR OTHER PACIFIC ISLANDER	27	1%	10	0%	1	0%
6. WHITE	2434	54%	1065	53%	509	53%
7. TWO OR MORE RACES	66	1%	33	2%	15	2%
BOYS	2982	66%	1314	66%	626	66%
GIRLS	1517	34%	687	34%	326	34%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

The following improvement activities were completed during the '10-'11 year.

- This year was the first year that family survey results were combined with child outcome data and used as the selection measure for focused monitoring visits. The survey item used was number 32; “Over the past year Birth to Three services have helped me figure out solutions to problems as they come up.” (See survey attached to the State Performance Plan.) One program received a visit based on family survey data that was more than 2 standard deviations below the mean for all programs. This program was found to deliver excellent child focused interventions. Families reported being happy with “therapy” but that they had not discussed nor received assistance with family outcomes. The records reviewed also did not provide evidence about how families participated in assessments, home visits, and between visits. There was also inadequate documentation about how family outcomes were addressed. The program has developed an improvement plan that is currently active.
- Program directors were given preliminary response rates in order to determine whether they might encourage staff to talk with families again about the importance of completing the survey.

- Connecticut has volunteered to be a partner state with the ECO Center’s Family Experiences Framework project.
- Connecticut completed two videos for families. One video was about their rights with regard to dispute resolution and another was about what a home visit should look which included a number of family outcomes. Both were posted on Birth23.org, the YouTube/CTBirth23 channel, and the Facebook.com/CTBirth23 page.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011 [If applicable]

- Connecticut will continue as a framework state with ECO.
- Family survey results and child outcome data will continue to be used as selection measures for focused monitoring visits.
- Part C staff will provide targeted technical assistance with programs that have a low response rates.
- If next year’s data reflect that these increases in results are part of a sustained upward trend and not just an artifact of variability, the lead agency will work with Dr. Batya Elbaum to attempt to discover what may be the root cause or causes of the increases.

Public Reporting of APR Data (direct link)

For each program, the APR data about this indicator will be posted by February 28, 2012 on Birth23.org under “How Are We Doing?”

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Same process as described in Indicator #1.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find
Indicator 5: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(# of infants and toddler birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to national data.	
FFY10	Measurable and Rigorous Target
7/1/10-6/30/11	1.20%

Actual Target Data for FFY10 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011):

Below is part of the 618 table submitted for children with IFSPs on December 1, 2010.

A.1. AGE AND RACE/ETHNICITY OF INFANTS AND TODDLERS, AGES BIRTH THROUGH 1				
	Total	Birth to 1 (0 to <12 months)	Census Population 0 only*	Percent
TOTAL	4499	451	38,012	1.19%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY10 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011):

When compared to national data, Connecticut ranks 20th among all the states and territories. Connecticut's percent served and census decreased. The state did not meet its target. Performance on this indicator has been variable. It has been selected as the state's topic for demonstrating progress on an indicator that focuses on results (the Part C "Results Topic").

Percent of children under 12 months of age served by year					
	Child Count	CT 0-1 Census	CT Census%	CT DPH	CT DPH %
12/1/10	451	38,012	1.2%	37,447	1.2%
12/1/09	516	41,216	1.3%	38,617	1.3%
12/1/08	496	42,446	1.2%	40,104	1.2%
12/1/07	392	42,233	0.9%	41,048	1.0%
12/1/06	442	41,496	1.1%	41,789	1.1%
12/1/05	387	41,815	0.9%	41,393	0.9%
12/1/04	441	42,732	1.0%	41,753	1.1%
12/1/03	419	43,031	1.0%	42,826	1.0%

*Source: http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=DEC_10_SF1_QTP2&prodType=table

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY11 (July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012) [If applicable]

[Public Reporting of APR Data](#) (direct link)

For each county, the APR data about this indicator will be posted by February 28, 2012 on Birth23.org under "How Are We Doing?".

During the '11-'12 year Connecticut selected a Results Topic about this indicator and revised the [State Performance Plan](#) (direct link).

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Same process as described in Indicator #1.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find
Indicator 6: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(# of infants and toddler birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to national data.	
FFY10	Measurable and Rigorous Target
7/1/10-6/30/11	3.19%

Actual Target Data for FFY10 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011):

Below is part of the 618 table submitted for children with IFSPs on December 1, 2008.

A.1. AGE AND RACE/ETHNICITY OF INFANTS AND TODDLERS, AGES BIRTH THROUGH 2			
	Total	Census Population 0+1+2*	Percent of Population
TOTAL	4499	117,688	3.82%

Connecticut’s percent served increased and the state continues to meet its targets. As discussed on the next page, performance on this indicator has trended upward since the ‘04-‘05 year (baseline 3.10%), the ‘05-‘06 year (3.16%), the ‘06-‘07 year (3.41%), the ‘07-‘08 year (3.35%), the ‘08-‘09 year (3.63%), and the ‘09-‘10 year (3.78%).

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY10 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011):

When compared to national data, Connecticut ranks 12th among the 50 states and territories and is well above the national average. Connecticut continues to meet its target.

Percent of children under 12 months of age served by year

	<u>Child Count</u>	<u>CT 0-3 Pop</u>	<u>CT%</u>
12/1/2010	4499	117,688	3.82%
12/1/2009	4743	125,428	3.78%
12/1/2008	4603	126,676	3.63%
12/1/2007	4182	125,729	3.33%
12/1/2006	4018	126,014	3.19%
12/1/2005	3970	127,580	3.11%
12/1/2004	3948	128,794	3.07%
12/1/2003	3701	129,143	2.87%

*Source: http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=DEC_10_SF1_QTP2&prodType=table

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY11 (July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012) [If applicable]

[Public Reporting of APR Data](#) (direct link)

For each county, the APR data about this indicator will be posted by February 28, 2012 on Birth23.org under “How Are We Doing?”.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Same as described under Indicator #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 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

<p>Measurement:</p> <p>Percent = [(# of 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 infants and toddlers with IFSPs evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.</p> <p>Account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.</p>

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
7/1/10-6/30/11	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:

99.9%

Using its statewide data system and data verification emails, Connecticut reviewed initial evaluation and initial IFSP data for all children for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted during the reporting year.

Infants Evaluated and Assessed and Provided an Initial IFSP Meeting Within Part C’s 45-Day Timeline:

a. Number of 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.	3703
b. Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom the State has identified the reason for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record. (Range 46-207 days)	614
c. Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted.	4320
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 (Percent = [(a) +(b) divided by (c)] times 100)	99.9%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2009:

There were only 3 children with late IFSPs due to the following reasons:
 2- Staff illness (Range 48-60 days)
 1- Extra time needed to complete audiological evaluation (50 days)

Connecticut has sustained a high level of compliance since the '08-'09 year APR (99%) and demonstrated progress as only three meetings were late as opposed to nine. In the '10-'11 year the percent of delays due to documented extraordinary family reasons increased slightly to 14% from 12% during the '09-'10 year.

The state explored some of the records that had a very high number of days to the initial IFSP due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. The reasons were consistent. Connecticut has a procedure in place for times when the early intervention provider has been unable to locate the family. The child's record can be reactivated as soon as the family reconnects with the program. This way, unless more than 6 months has passed depending on the child's age, an IFSP meeting can be held and services may begin as quickly as possible without completing a new eligibility determination

Correction of '09-'10 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for '09-'10 for this indicator: 99 %

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during '09-'10 (the period from July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010)	1
2. Number of '09-'10 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	1
3. Number of '09-'10 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Verification of Correction of FFY 2009 noncompliance or FFY 2009 findings (either timely or subsequent):

The state verified timely correction for the one program about this one measure.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009:

The state verified the correction of all systemic and child-specific noncompliance using a combination of onsite verification visits, reports from the statewide database, emails with providers, and the secure faxing of documents. In its '09-'10 APR, Connecticut accounted for all instances of noncompliance with the timely initial IFSP provisions identified through the review of database data and other monitoring procedures. As required, Connecticut identified each of the programs with noncompliance and notified them of the measure, the statutory reference, the raw scores, and the percent. Programs were required to determine the root cause of the noncompliance and revise policies, procedures and practices that

resulted in noncompliance as appropriate. Once correction was reported at least three months of subsequent data were reviewed that demonstrated 100% compliance with the timely service provision requirements.

Through this combination of efforts, the lead agency verified that the program with noncompliance identified in the '09-'10 year has conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, for any child for whom the 45-day timeline was not met, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the Birth to Three program. The lead agency also verified that the program was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, based on a review of subsequent data, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
"If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary."	The lead agency found that the noncompliance during the '10-'11 year was very limited (3 / 4320) and often due to human error.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011 (if applicable):

A new improvement strategy has been added to the [State Performance Plan \(SPP\)](#) since the new Part C Regulations require that a multidisciplinary team be at IFSP meetings. The lead agency will review and revise its procedures as needed and modify its data system to collect whether two different disciplines are at the meetings as required.

There is no outstanding correction of identified child-specific or systemic noncompliance. The lead agency will continue to use a variety of methods to monitor that all initial evaluations and IFSP meetings are held in a timely manner.

[Public Reporting of APR Data](#) *(direct link)*

For each program, the APR data about this indicator will be posted by February 28, 2012 on Birth23.org under "How Are We Doing?".

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Same process as described in Indicator #1.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Indicator 8A: 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;
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

A. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C)] times 100.

FFY10	Measurable and Rigorous Target
7/1/10-6/30/11	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY10 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011):

100%

Children Exiting Part C who Received Timely Transition Planning:

a. Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	4502
b. Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP	4502
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 (Percent = [(a) divided by (b)] times 100)	100%

Data are from the Connecticut Birth to Three data system for the full reporting period.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2010:

Connecticut met its target. This demonstrates sustained compliance from percentages during ‘04-‘05 year (baseline 100%), the ‘05-‘06 year (99.9%), ‘06-‘07 year (99.9%), the ‘07-08 year (100%), the ‘08-‘09 year (100%), and the ‘09-‘10 year (100%).

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2009 for this indicator: 100 %

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011 (if applicable):

A new improvement strategy has been added to the State Performance Plan (SPP) since the new Part C Regulations added a timeline. The lead agency will revise procedures to assure that the transition plan in each IFSP includes steps and services and is completed between nine months and 90 days before age three for every child with an initial IFSP meeting held before 33 months of age.

[Public Reporting of APR Data](#) (*direct link*)

For each program, the APR data about this indicator will be posted by February 28, 2012 on Birth23.org under “How Are We Doing?”.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Same as described under Indicator #1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition
<p>Indicator 8B: 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:</p> <p>B Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B;</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p>

<p>Measurement:</p> <p>Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the notification to the LEA occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.</p>

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
7/1/10-6/30/11	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:

100%

Using its statewide database, the lead agency exported required notification data to the State Department of Education (SDE) about 3713 children who would shortly be turning 3 and who may have been eligible for preschool special education. The SDE then made the data available to school districts (a.k.a Local Education Agencies or LEAs) as part of its Special Education Data Application and Collection (SEDAC) data system. The exports were completed in August 2010, December 2010, and April 2011.

Children Exiting Part C who Received Timely Transition Planning (Notification to LEA):

a. Number of children exiting Part C who may have been eligible for Part B where the notification to the LEA occurred	3713
b. Number of children exiting Part C who may have been eligible for Part B	3713
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 (Notification to LEA) (Percent = [(a) divided by (b)] times 100)	100%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2010:

The state continues to meet its target.

As described in the '09-'10 APR the lead agency discontinued its opt-out procedure effective July 1, 2010. Connecticut notifies the State Department of Education (SDE) and Local Education Agencies (LEAs) about all children enrolled in Birth to Three that are over the age of 2 ½. Because they are still eligible for Part C at that age, they “may be eligible for preschool services” (1999 Regulations §303.148(b)(2)(i)).

Families continue to have the right to approve or not approve convening a conference among the lead agency, the family, and the school district. In addition, because the lead agency notifies the SDE and LEAs about all children over age 2 ½ that are eligible for Part C when the data is run, the export includes children who are within 90 days of age 3.

Therefore with the process in place during the '10-'11 year, the total number of children about which the SDE and local school districts were notified was higher than the total number of children who were determined to be potentially eligible for preschool special education under Indicator 8C.

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2009 for this indicator: 100 %

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010 (if applicable):

Two new improvement strategy has been added to the [State Performance Plan \(SPP\)](#) since the new Part C Regulations added a timeline. Staff from the lead agency and the CSDE will revise the systems for electronic data transfers so that notification occurs for all children who are potentially eligible no fewer than 90 days before age three.

and

The lead agency will develop new mechanisms for collecting, analyzing, and reporting data about compliance this new timeline requirement by local program.

[Public Reporting of APR Data](#) (*direct link*)

For each county, the APR data about this indicator will be posted by February 28, 2012 on Birth23.org under “How Are We Doing?”.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:
Same as described under Indicator #1**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition
Indicator 8C: 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: C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: 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. Account for untimely transition conferences, including reasons for delays.
--

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
7/1/10-6/30/11	100%

Actual Target Data for the '10-'11 year:

98%

Using its statewide database the lead agency reviewed transition conference data for all children who were potentially eligible for preschool special education and for whom a transition conference was due to occur between 7/1/10 and 6/30/11.

Children Exiting Part C who Received Timely Transition Planning (Transition Conference):

a. Number of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for preschool special education where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days before age 3.	2319
b. Number of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for preschool special education where the transition conference was delayed due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. (Range 89-2 days with 12 not held before 3)	200
c. Number of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B and for whom a transition conference was due to occur.	2567
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 (Transition Conference) (Percent = [((a)+(b)) divided by (c)] times 100)	98%

Connecticut has 4666 children in the Birth to Three database with a date of birth that would have them turn age three during the '10-'11 year. 3365 of those children exited during the reporting year (the others exited before the '10-'11 year). 2873 children exited Birth to Three because they turned three years old.

Three of the 2873 children were referred to Birth to Three fewer than 45 days before age three and 81 children were referred between 45 and 90 days before age three. The families of 210 of the remaining 2789 children did not approve convening a conference with their district prior to 90 days before age three and the families of 12 children approved of convening a conference with their school district less than one week before the 90 day deadline. Eight of the 12 were referred to Birth to Three within 135 days of age three and only two had been in Birth to Three over six months. Stakeholders in Connecticut determined that families, service coordinators, and school districts would require at least one week to schedule a conference and the families of all 12 children ultimately had transition conferences (Range 78-37 days before age three). These 12 records were not included numerator or the denominator.

For the purpose of this APR measure, “potentially eligible” in Connecticut means that the child was still eligible for Birth to Three over the age of 30 months, the family exited Birth to Three after age 33 months, and that at least 97 days before age three, the parent approved of including their district in the conference.

As a result, 2567 children were determined to be potentially eligible for preschool special education during the ‘10-’11 year for the purpose of this APR measure. Based on verification emails, conferences for 200 families were held late or were not held prior to the children turning age three due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 200 were included in the numerator and the denominator.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in ‘10-’11:

While Connecticut did not meet its target, the state continues to present with very high levels of compliance. There was slippage since the ‘09-’10 year from 99% to 98% in part because of an increase in the number of children referred to Birth to Three between 135 and 91 days before 3.

The reasons for the 48 late conferences were as follows:

22 – due to the child being referred to Birth to Three between 135 and 91 days before age three. In these few cases the provider and family did not have sufficient time to complete an evaluation, assessment, and hold the initial IFSP meeting within 45 days of referral PLUS plan a timely transition conference. (Range 86-26 days; four children turned three before the meeting could be held).

13 – due to staff who did not understand the procedure and waited for a date when a representative from the school district was able to come out to the family’s home. (Range 88-23 days; one child turned three before the meeting could be held)

13 – due to staff errors in scheduling and staff illness. (Range 88-47 days)

This resulted in five new findings of noncompliance issued to five programs on 10/13/11 with verified correction due no later than 10/13/12 to be reported in the APR due in February 2014.

Correction of ‘09-’10 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for ‘09-’10 for this indicator: 99%

There were only 12 late conferences by 11 different programs during the ‘09-’10 year. There were no findings because Connecticut verified that the noncompliance was corrected prior to issuing the finding (within 3 months of discovering noncompliance)

each instance of noncompliance was either corrected or the child exited Birth to Three and there was evidence using subsequent data that there were at least 3 months during which all (100%) conferences were on time in each program.

Verification of Correction of '09-'10 noncompliance or '09-'10 findings (either timely or subsequent):

The state verifies the correction of all systemic and child-specific noncompliance using a combination of onsite verification visits, reports from the statewide database, emails with providers, and the secure faxing of documents. In its '09-'10 APR, Connecticut accounted for all instances of noncompliance with timely transition conferences identified through the review of database data and other monitoring procedures. As required, Connecticut identified each of the programs with noncompliance and notified them of the measure, the statutory reference, the raw scores, and the percent. Programs were required to determine the root cause of the noncompliance and revise policies, procedures and practices that resulted in noncompliance as appropriate. At least three months of subsequent data were reviewed that demonstrated 100% compliance with the timely service provision requirements.

Through this combination of efforts, the lead agency verified that each program with noncompliance in '09-'10 conducted a transition conference, although late, for any child potentially eligible for Part B whose transition conference was not timely, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the Birth to Three program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). Programs with findings from the '09-'10 year were found to be correctly implementing the requirements related to this indicator during the '10-'11 year.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
"If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary."	The lead agency found that the noncompliance during the '10-'11 year was very limited (48 / 2566). Most were due to the challenges faced when a child is referred within 135 days of age three. The rest were often due to human error as new staff learn the rules.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for '10-'11 (if applicable):

No revisions at this time. The lead agency will track the timely correction of the five new findings issued on October 13, 2011 based the analysis and ultimate verification of this full year of APR data. The lead agency will continue to use a variety of methods to ensure that all transition conferences are held on time.

[Public Reporting of APR Data](#) (direct link)

For each program, the APR data about this indicator will be posted by February 28, 2012 on Birth23.org under "How Are We Doing?".

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Same process as described in Indicator #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:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

States are required to use the “Indicator 9 Worksheet” to report data for this indicator (see Attachment A).

FFY10	Measurable and Rigorous Target
7/1/10- 6/30/11	100%

NOTE: Connecticut Part C identifies one finding per regulatory reference even if there are multiple instances (records) of noncompliance. The totals below are based on all of the state’s monitoring components and not just APR data.

Actual Target Data for FFY10 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011):

91.4%

The worksheet required for this indicator is attached as Appendix A (aka Attachment 1).

Describe the process for selecting EIS programs for Monitoring:

Connecticut monitors all programs on the four APR measures once per year using a full year of data from the data system with a data accuracy verification process completed via email.

As described in previous APRs, in order to respond to noncompliance on Indicator 7 – Timely Evaluations and Initial IFSP meetings, the lead agency contracted with new programs. In addition contracts were written with new Autism Specific Programs.

These new programs were monitored more directly and more often than agencies that had been supporting families for this lead agency since 1996.

APR Template – Part C (4)

Connecticut
State

New programs were given a period of time to receive training and TA on the many Birth to Three procedures. Enough time was needed so that new programs could serve a sufficient number of families from referral through to transition at age three in order to make the data from a review of records meaningful. Between November 2009 and May 2010 onsite record reviews were completed to 11 new programs. Findings were issued and tracked.

Experienced programs had a long history of onsite monitoring visits and had each already completed two previous self-assessments (formerly called Biennial Performance Reports or BPR). The experienced programs were usually placed into cohorts to spread the verification and tracking of correction from the self assessments out over a 2-3 years cycle. Because the lead agency was required to rebid all the program contracts during the '11-'12 year it was decided that all experienced programs would complete a new self-assessment by July 31, 2010 with findings issued no later than September 30, 2010.

In addition to onsite record reviews and self-assessments one program was selected for an onsite data verification visit based on an increase in the number of complaints from families about the program and questionable data.

Finding Issued During the '09-'10 Year		How Monitored				
EIS Provider	Date Monitored	APR Data	Complaint	Data Verification Visit	Onsite Record Review	Grand Total
New Autism Specific Program	20-Jun-09		2			2
	01-Mar-10				8	8
New Autism Specific Program	15-Dec-09				12	12
Experienced Program	04-Sep-09			6		6
New Autism Specific Program	11-Jan-10				8	8
	15-May-10				1	1
Experienced Program	26-Aug-09	1				1
Experienced Program	04-Sep-09	1				1
New General Program	20-Aug-09	1				1
	30-Mar-10				6	6
New General Program	27-Jul-09	1				1
	24-Aug-09	1				1
New General Program	11-Mar-10				3	3
Experienced Program	31-Aug-09	1				1
New General Program	24-Nov-09				10	10
New General Program	21-Dec-09				8	8
Grand Total		6	2	6	56	70

There were no Focused Monitoring visits during the '09-'10 year as the lead agency contracted with WESTED to evaluate the system and stakeholders used the year to revise the priority area and protocol.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2009:

Connecticut experienced slippage and did not meet its target for during the '10-'11 year for verifying the timely correction of findings made during the '09-'10 year. During the '06-'07 year, 93% of 171 findings were verified as corrected in a timely manner; during the '07-'08 year, 97% of 63 were; during the '08-'09 year, 90% of 39 findings were; and during the '09-'10 year 100% of 55 findings were verified as corrected in a timely manner.

All written findings of child-specific and/or systemic noncompliance sent to a local program with a date prior to 6/30/10 have been verified as corrected and the corrections have been verified as sustained (minimum of 3 consecutive months) using on-site visits, faxes, emails, and current data reports. Details about which verification procedures were used are described under each indicator.

Timely Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2009 (the period from July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010) (Sum of Column a on the Indicator C 9 Worksheet)	70
2. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS programs of the finding) (Sum of Column b on the Indicator C 9 Worksheet)	64
3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	6

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

4. Number of FFY 2009 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	6
5. Number of FFY 2009 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	6
6. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Verification of Correction of findings during the '09-'10 year (either timely or subsequent)

For the 64 findings timely corrected, Connecticut verified correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

The state verified the correction of all systemic and child-specific noncompliance using a combination of onsite verification visits, reports from the statewide database, emails with providers, and the secure faxing of documents. As required, Connecticut identified each of the programs with noncompliance and notified them of the measure, the statutory reference, the

raw scores, and the percent. Programs were required to determine the root cause of the noncompliance and revise policies, procedures and practices that resulted in noncompliance as appropriate. Once correction was reported at least three months of subsequent data were reviewed that demonstrated 100% compliance with the timely service provision requirements.

Through this combination of efforts, the lead agency verified that each program with noncompliance identified in the '09-'10 year corrected each individual instance, including ensuring requirements were met, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the Birth to Three program, and is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, based on a review of subsequent data, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

For the three programs with the six findings of noncompliance that were not corrected in a timely manner the lead agency has verified that they are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data for one finding and based on on-site visits and securely faxed documents for the other five findings as of November 15, 2011 (Range 13-25 months). The three programs corrected each individual case of noncompliance within two weeks of discovery, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction in the '10-'11 year of findings of noncompliance identified during the '09-'10 year:

Corrective action plans were developed with all three programs highlighting required objectives, timelines, and people responsible as well as sanctions. All three programs had their contracts renewed for half of the full 2 year period and letters were sent confirming that, if the required actions were not completed, the contract would not be renewed.

Correction was verified for a new comprehensive general program by a combination of secure faxing of required documents for two findings and an updated data report for the third.

Correction was verified for a new autism specific program for one finding during an onsite visit.

Correction was verified for an experienced comprehensive general program by a combination of secure faxing of required documents for one finding and an onsite visit for the second.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010 (if applicable):

All noncompliance identified during the '09-'10 year was either verified as corrected in a timely manner or subsequently verified as corrected as of November 15, 2011 (Range 13-25 months).

A new improvement strategy has been added to the [State Performance Plan \(SPP\)](#) due to slippage. The lead agency will review and revise, as needed, the procedures in place to remind programs about pending deadlines for timely correction. The Accountability and Monitoring data tracking module will be updated. Reports will be added to the web-based data system to help the lead agency and programs track and verify the timely correction noncompliance.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

Same process as described in Indicator #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 = 1.1(b) + 1.1(c) divided by 1.1] times 100.

FFY10	Measurable and Rigorous Target
7/1/10-6/30/11	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY10 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011):

100%

There were five signed written complaints during the '10-'11 year. Response letters for all five were sent within 60-days. The response letters for four complaints identified findings. The timely verification of correction of those findings is due during the '11-'12 year and will be addressed in the FFY11 APR submitted February 1, 2013.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY10 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011):

Connecticut met its target.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY10 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011) [If applicable]

A new improvement strategy has been added to the State Performance Plan (SPP) since the new Part C Regulations now permit parties to agree to extend the 60 timeline to engage in mediation. The lead agency will revise procedures and family handbooks to match the new regulations regarding the option for parties to agree extend the timeline to participate in mediation.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Same process as described in Indicator #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 = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

FFY10	Measurable and Rigorous Target
7/1/10-6/30/11	NA

Actual Target Data for FFY10 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011):

NA

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY10 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011):

NA

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY10 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011) [If applicable]

A new improvement strategy has been added to the [State Performance Plan \(SPP\)](#) since the new Part C Regulations now permit hearing officers to agree to extend the applicable timeline. The lead agency will revise procedures and related handbooks to match the new regulations regarding the option for hearing officers to extend the timeline for a due process hearing.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Same process as described in Indicator #1.

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

FFY10	Measurable and Rigorous Target
7/1/10-6/30/11	NA

Actual Target Data for FFY10 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011):

NA – Does not apply in CT

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY10 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011):

NA

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY10 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011) [If applicable]

NA

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Same process as described in Indicator #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 = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

FFY10	Measurable and Rigorous Target
7/1/10-6/30/11	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY10 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011):

[(0+1)/1] x 100 = 100%

There was one mediation request not related to due process complaints during the '10-'11 year that resulted in a mediation agreement.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY10 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011):

NA

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY10 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011) [If applicable]

No revisions at this time. Connecticut will continue to track the timely correction of all noncompliance identified through mediation.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Same process as described in Indicator #1.

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 and settings and November 1 for exiting and dispute resolution); and	
b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement.	
States are required to use the “Indicator 14 Data Rubric” for reporting data for this indicator (see Attachment B).	
FFY10	Measurable and Rigorous Target
7/1/10-6/30/11	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY10 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011):

100%

The required worksheet for this indicator follows as [Attachment B](#) (a.k.a. [Attachment 2](#)).

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY10 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011):

Connecticut met its target.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY10 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011) [If applicable]

No revisions at this time

Attachment A / Attachment 1

INDICATOR C-9 WORKSHEET

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 through 6/30/10)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 through 6/30/10)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	11	19	16
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	1	2	2
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	1	1	1
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved outcomes	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	1	2	2
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0

APR Template – Part C (4)

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 through 6/30/10)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 through 6/30/10)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	6	9	8
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	9	25	24
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0

APR Template – Part C (4)

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 through 6/30/10)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 through 6/30/10)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE: Procedural Safeguards	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	7	12	11
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b			70	64

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100

Attachment B / Attachment 2

Part C Indicator 14 Data Rubric			
SPP/APR Data - Indicator 14			
APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Correct Calculation	Total
1	1	1	2
2	1	1	2
3	1	1	2
4	1	1	2
5	1	1	2
6	1	1	2
7	1	1	2
8a	1	1	2
8b	1	1	2
8c	1	1	2
9	1	1	2
10	1	1	2
11	1	1	2
12	N/A	N/A	0
13	1	1	2
		Subtotal	28
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2010 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.		5
	Grand Total - (Sum of subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =		33

NA is used for Indicator 12 in keeping with the automated table created by OSEP and distributed on the SPP-APR calendar on 12/16/09

618 Data - Indicator 14					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Data Note Requests	Total
Table 1 - Child Count Due Date: 2/1/10	1	1	1	1	4
Table 2 - Program Settings Due Date: 2/1/10	1	1	1	1	4
Table 3 - Exiting Due Date: 11/1/10	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 4 - Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/10	1	1	1	N/A	3
				Subtotal	14
618 Score Calculation			Grand Total (Subtotal X 2.5) =		35

Indicator #14 Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	33.00
B. 618 Grand Total	35.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	68.00
Total NA in APR	2.00
Total NA in 618	0.00
Base	68.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Base*) =	1.000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.0

*Note any cell marked as N/A will decrease the denominator by 1 for APR and 2.5 for 618