

Connecticut Birth to Three System - Focused Monitoring Summary Report

Agency Name: CREC-Soundbridge
Program: CREC-Soundbridge

Visit Dates: April 22-24, 2014
Report Date: July 14, 2014

Priority Area:
As a result of early intervention families are more confident and gain new skills which, help their children develop and learn.

Selection Reason: The return rate and average measure from the Impact on Families Scale of the NCSEAM family survey for the CREC-Soundbridge Birth to Three program were both low when compared to other programs in Connecticut.

Components of Focused Monitoring

Desk audit. Agency administrator interview. Reviewed 11 records - representative sample of service coordinators, towns, income levels. Interviewed 15 families by phone. Interviewed 8 of 11 staff (5 in person and 3 by phone.) Held end of day summary meetings and exit meeting on the last day.

Focused Monitoring Team

Team Leader: Anna Hollister Parent Members: Pam Kelly, Deborah Pagano, Darla Gundler Peer: Diane Brackett B23: Alice Ridgway Bob Kiernan Bill Meakim

- Hypotheses:**
- 1 The family survey return rate was low and this may have been because the program did not encourage Service Coordinators to return the surveys. Parents of children with hearing loss were confused about how to answer some of the survey questions because they were not relevant to their concerns and issues.
 - 2 CREC-Soundbridge is providing quality services to children and families.
 - 3 Soundbridge parents believe that Soundbridge Birth to Three services help their child hear, and help them [the parents] to help their child learn to listen and talk (or " hear, learn and develop).

- Findings**
- 1 The average measure for all 3 hearing specialty programs was lower as compared to autism specific programs and general comprehensive programs. The program as a whole may not see the value in documenting families early intervention experiences starting with the evaluation through the IFSP which may affect the families willingness to complete the family survey. It was noted that strategies in visit notes did not emphasize naturally occurring learning opportunities embedded into daily routines (10% 1/10) and home visit notes did not reflect families use of strategies between visits (0%). In addition some families felt assessments were "somewhat generic" and didn't feel they were reflective of what their child needed" . Also one family said their IFSP was "too technical". During the actual home visits when asked if there was time available to talk one family said, "most of the time was spent with me, she observed my child and helped me teach him".
 - 2 The record reviews and family interviews demonstrate that some staff at CREC-Soundbridge are still providing a child focused approach versus a more family focused approach. An example of a more comprehensive family approach was seen in GB's IFSP which - was beautifully written included routines- based strategies and outcomes. Although the format of the contact notes provide a place for staff to record the families use of strategies between visits, many were blank or addressed the child's development. The strategies in the IFSPs and visit notes were not consistently routines based. Some families reported that their visitor only focused on the child's development. 5 out of the 9 (56%) families talked about their family outcomes. There was not consistent understanding from the families that their home visitor was there to help them learn how to find information about other resources. The biography page that was created by a staff member (AM) will be a useful tool as the child transitions. The transition planning for families was a valuable strength of the program and included examples like Mom being encouraged to speak at PPTs. The program does a great job of accommodating family's needs and coordinating visits, one family talked about the audiologist coming to her home because of a unique medical condition.

Connecticut Birth to Three System - Focused Monitoring Summary Report

Agency Name: CREC-Soundbridge

Visit Dates April 22-24, 2014

Program: CREC-Soundbridge

Report Date: July 14, 2014

Findings (cont.)

3 Some families said they were shown strategies to help their children learn to hear and develop language. The evaluation reports were not comprehensive and did not have individualized description of the child's strengths, areas of concern, and next steps in development as they are related to daily routines were 18% in the record review and 64% reported by families. Some parents expressed they were very involved with family programming and one Mom said "I drove the process" and another said when referring to the IFSP "they were my outcome/goals". Some families reported that each child receives equipment for example a personal FM system.

Strengths

Families felt that they have excellent support with their child's hearing loss. The program connects families with each other and as an outcome they 'are getting together for potlucks, playdates and peer support. Marion's presentation on transition is an excellent support for families. The timing of home visits was related to child and family outcomes and staff worked diligently to accomodate families schedules. One parent reported that Allison described her relationship with parents as "You are my Student".

Measures out of compliance that must be verified as corrected by 4/14/15

Monitoring Measure*	Measure	Results From On-site Visit	Minimum Criteria
3	Prior Written Notice Form 1-6 is given to the family for any IFSP meetings initiated by the program or any meeting requested by the parent where changes were expected and/or eventually made to the IFSP.	(2/11) 18%	100%
29	All periodic reviews and annual evaluations of the IFSP are held within mandated timeframes or for any that are late, the reasons for ALL delays are documented.	(9/11) 81%	100%
7	TYPED last annual evaluation/assessment or initial report includes: current levels of functioning across all 5 areas of development including vision & hearing (1x in the one report)	(5/11) 45%	100%
8	TYPED last annual evaluation/assessment or initial report includes: individualized description of the child's strengths, areas of concern, and next steps in development as they are related to daily routines (1x per area in the one report)	(2/11) 18%	100%
44	For individuals that are limited English proficient (LEP), there is documentation that B23 forms were offered in the family's language and that accommodations were made to facilitate the families participation in visits with interpreters including the Native language for individuals who are deaf or harding of hearing, blind or visually impaired or who have no written language.	(2/3) 67%	100%

Measures in need of improvement to be included on the program's improvement plan

15	Last annual IFSP or Initial IFSP includes: outcomes are functional for the child and family, reflecting the family's priorities within daily activities, using positive, jargon-free, discipline-free,	(5/11) 45%	100%
17	Last annual IFSP or Initial IFSP includes: strategies match identified needs (family priorities, referral concerns, & assessment results) and daily routines (All strategies in the IFSP)	(6/11) 55%	100%

Connecticut Birth to Three System - Focused Monitoring Summary Report

Agency Name: CREC-Soundbridge
 Program: CREC-Soundbridge

Visit Dates: April 22-24, 2014
 Report Date: July 14, 2014

Measures in need of improvement to be included on the program's improvement plan (cont.)			
Monitoring Measure*	Measure	Results From On-site Visit	Minimum Criteria
27	The rationale(s) behind changes to IFSPs are clearly explained on the outcome pages (All reviews)	(7/11) 78%	100%
30	A statement about progress on each outcome is documented on the outcome page. (All Reviews)	(6/11) 55%	100%
34	Strategies in visit notes emphasize naturally occurring learning opportunities embedded into daily routines. (3 consecutive months)	(1/11) 9%	100%
35	Notes reflect families' use of strategies between visits (3 consecutive months)	(0/11) 0%	100%
47	Service coordination activities are documented at least 1 time per month (3 consecutive months)	(6/11) 55%	100%

* Please refer to the Current Monitoring Measures on Birth23.org for the regulatory references as applicable