

APR Template – Part C (4)

Connecticut
State

To: Gregg Corr, Director MSIP
From: Alice Ridgway, Part C Accountability Manager
Date: May 14, 2013
Re: Response to ct-status-2013c.doc

This is Connecticut's revised Annual Performance Report (APR) for the Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (FFY11 or 7/1/11 – 6/30/12). Based on feedback from the Office of Special Education Programs received on April 30, 2013, changes were made as described below and as highlighted in the APR in red.

The table on page 26, Indicator 8c, was modified to show that no findings of non-compliance were issued during FFY10 (7/1/10 – 6/30/11). This is now correctly less than or equal to the number of findings listed in the table (Attachment A) that supports Indicator 9. Previously, the table on page 26 listed five findings as timely corrected but those findings were issued on 10/17/11 which was in fact FFY11 and will be reported as timely corrected in the FFY12 APR due in February 2014. The narrative on page 27 was also modified to match that no findings were issued during the '10-'11 year.

The total findings reported in Attachment A and under Indicator 9, which includes related requirements, were originally correct and have not been changed.

On pages 36-38, Connecticut mistakenly listed the number of programs *monitored* in the first column of Attachment A as was the practice for 2 years before the table became an attachment. That has been updated to report only the number of programs *issued findings* in FFY 2010.

This APR is available on Birth23.org on the Annual Performance Report page under How Are We Doing? Connecticut did not make any changes to its Part C State Performance Plan through the clarification process.

Thank you for the opportunity to help clarify this APR.

**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 §303.604(c), 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 15, 2013.

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

1. ☐ Submitting its own annual report (which is attached); or
- mg 2. ☒ Using the State's Part C APR for FFY 2011 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.

Mark A. Greenstein MD
Signature of ICC Chairperson

1/28/13
Date

MARK A. Greenstein, MD

MGreens@ccnckids.org

Address or e-mail

860.966.6975
Daytime telephone number

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 15, 2013.

APR Template – Part C (4)

Connecticut
State

NOTE: This *Executive Summary* mirrors a table sent to states by the US Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs. Each indicator is addressed more fully on pages 6-37.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Executive Summary			
1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2011 reported data for this indicator are 97%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2010 data of 99%. The State did not meet its FFY 2011 target of 100%. The State reported that four of five findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 were corrected in a timely manner and that the one remaining finding subsequently was corrected by August 15, 2012.			
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2011 reported data for this indicator are 99%. The State's data reflect a high level of performance for this indicator. The State met its FFY 2011 target of 95%.			
3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationship); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]	The State's reported data for this indicator are:			
	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2011 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2011 Target</u>
	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	83.1 (n=2476)	77.6 (n=2023)	84.7
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	83.2 (n=2623)	84.3 (n=2344)	88.0
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	88.8 (n=2515)	87.8 (n=2054)	88.5
	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2010</u>	<u>FFY 2011</u>	<u>FFY 2011 Target</u>
	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	55.6 (n=2816)	58.6 (n=2554)	51.2
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	53.8 (n=2816)	50.6 (n=2554)	53.8
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	63.6 (n=2816)	69.6 (n=2554)	53.2%
	These data represent progress on three summary statements and slippage on the other three from the FFY 2010 data. The State met two of its six FFY 2011 targets for this indicator (Outcomes A&C - SS2)			

APR Template – Part C (4)

Connecticut
State

4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family: A. Know their rights; B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs; and C. Help their children develop and learn. [Results Indicator]		<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2011 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2011 Target</u>
	A. Know their rights (%)	87.9	84.5	83
	B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)	86.3	82.7	80
	C. Help their children develop and learn (%)	94.7	92.3	91
	The State met all of its FFY 2011 targets for this indicator. These data appear to represent slippage from the FFY 2010 data but they are in fact more in line with the FFY09 and FFY08 data.			
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data. [Results Indicator]	The State’s FFY 2011 reported data for this indicator are 1.25%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2010 data of 1.23%. The State met its FFY 2011 target of 1.20%.			
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data. [Results Indicator]	The State’s FFY 2011 reported data for this indicator are 3.87%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2010 data of 3.82%. The State met its FFY 2011 target of 3.19%.			
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. [Compliance Indicator]	The State’s FFY 2011 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2010 data of 99%. The State met its FFY 2011 target. The State reported that the three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator were all corrected in a timely manner.			
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; and [Compliance Indicator]	The State’s FFY 2011 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2010 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2011 target of 100%.			
B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and [Compliance Indicator]	The State’s FFY 2011 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2010 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2011 target of 100%.			
C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B. [Compliance Indicator]	The State’s FFY 2011 reported data for this indicator are 99%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2010 data of 98%. The State did not meet its FFY 2011 target of 100%.			

APR Template – Part C (4)

Connecticut
State

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. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2011 reported data for this indicator are 88.5%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2010 data of 91.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2011 target of 100%. The State reported that 54 of 61 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 were corrected in a timely manner and that the seven remaining findings were subsequently corrected by August 15, 2012.
10. & 11.	The State is not required to report on indicators 10 and 11 in the FFY 2011 APR.
12.	Does not apply - Part C did not adopt Part B due process procedures
13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State reported, as of January 31, 2012, that the one mediation that was held did not result in an agreement.
14. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2011 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2010 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2011 target of 100%.

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

For each program or county, the APR data about all indicators will be posted by February 28, 2013 on Birth23.org under "How Are We Doing?"

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2011

Throughout this document years are represented as '11-'12 representing the calendar year of July 1 of the first year ('11) to June 30 of the last year ('12) regardless of the federal fiscal year.

	Current Improvement Strategies Required to be Included in the APR	p. 7
1	Infants and toddlers receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.	p. 8
2	Infants and toddlers primarily receive early intervention services in the home or in programs for typically developing children.	p. 12
3a	Infants and toddlers demonstrate improved: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships).	p. 13
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. 16
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.	
5	The percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1.	p. 18
6	The percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3.	p. 19
7	Families of infants and toddlers referred to Birth to Three have an evaluation / assessment and an initial IFSP meeting within 45 days.	p. 20
8a	All children exiting Part C receive timely transition planning including IFSPs with transition steps and services.	p. 23
8b	Notification to LEA of all children exiting Part C, if child potentially eligible for Part B.	p. 24
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	The State is not required to report on Indicator 10 in the FFY 2011 APR.	NA
11	The State is not required to report on Indicator 11 in the FFY 2011 APR.	
12	Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions (Not-applicable for Part C in Connecticut).	p. 33
13	Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.	p. 34
14	State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.	p. 35
A	Indicator C-9 Worksheet	p. 36

NOTE: If viewing this electronically, each blue indicator above is a hyperlink to a bookmark. To move between indicators type **Ctrl + g** and then type **ind#** where # is the indicator number (e.g. ind5). In addition, other blue text in the document is usually an external link to related files such the [Public Reporting](#) tables posted on www.birthe23.org under the menu option that reads "How are we doing?".

Current Improvement Strategies Required to be Included in the APR

This is not an exhaustive list of all the improvements Connecticut is working on but just a list of those activities related to Indicators 1, 3, 8 and 9 where the state did not meet its target. Each includes a hyperlink directly to the related indicator.

[Indicator 1 – Timely New Services](#): Slight slippage (2%) and compliance not at 100%

The lead agency will continue to remind new staff at service coordination training that the deadline for new services to begin in Connecticut is 45 days from the parent's consent for services which is usually at the IFSP meeting and not 45 days from the IFSP projected start date. Program directors will also be reminded in bi-weekly newsletters. In addition programs will be reminded regularly that services planned to occur only monthly still have to begin within 45 days and that staff should not wait until the next month for their first visit.

[Indicator 3 – Child Outcomes](#): Progress and slippage and only some targets met

Connecticut switched to a new Child Outcome Summary form in July 2010 that included the decision tree developed by the ECO Center. It is anticipated that this will improve the consistency of ratings across programs. Data from some children who exited during '11-'12 year was collected using two different forms at entry and exit. It will not be until the '13-'14 year that all children that exit will have had both entry and exit ratings completed on the new form.

Connecticut continues to analyze the quality of its child outcome data at the local level and actively participates on ECO Center COS Community of Practice calls. The state will build a new online module to answer recurring questions from service coordinators. Efforts will also be focused on better understanding why the results of some summary statements (SS) did not meet the FFY11 target and also experienced slippage (Outcome A - SS1, Outcome C – SS1, and Outcome B – SS2) while others met the targets or showed progress.

[Indicator 8c – Timely Transition Conferences](#): Progress but compliance not at 100%

The lead agency will continue to remind new staff at service coordination training that the transition conference must be convened by Part C staff and Part B staff must be invited but the conference must be held on time regardless of whether the school district attends. With the State Department of Education, the lead agency will also remind preschool coordinators of this. Birth to Three programs will be reminded of the Part C regulatory language about this in the every other week provider update emails to share with LEAs as needed.

[Indicator 9 – Timely Correction of Identified Noncompliance](#): Slippage and not 100% compliant

The lead agency will revisit the timing of the verification of correction of findings issued based on self-assessments to assure that if correction cannot be verified that enough time is available for timely correction. In addition, the process for reminding programs about progress updates and correction deadlines will be reviewed and if needed revised and implemented.

The low number of findings has an impact on the percent reported each year. If necessary to meet requirements, Connecticut may consider issuing findings based on APR data and quickly using subsequent data to verify correction to increase the number of findings.

[Indicator 13 - Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements](#):

In Connecticut's [State Performance Plan](#) the target for this indicator is NA because states are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10 per year and Connecticut has never has more than 5 in one year in the history of Part C/Part H of the IDEA. The APR target last year was listed as 100% and this year reads as "NA".

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for the 2011-2012 Year
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

A subcommittee of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) met via a webinar on November 30, 2012 to review a draft of the [State Performance Plan \(SPP\)](#) and APR. An overview was then presented to the entire ICC on December 10, 2012. Drafts were reviewed at regional provider meetings in early December and the final draft was posted on Birth23.org on December 20, 2012. Notification was also given to the PTI and the Connecticut's Family Support Network. All early intervention providers and parent groups were also notified that the final draft was available for review on the website through the biweekly electronic Birth to Three Provider Newsletter. Announcements were also posted on the CTBirth23 facebook page and via Twitter. Between January 19, 2013 and January 30, 2013 the document was finalized based on broad stakeholder input.

In addition to having Connecticut stakeholders review and revise the draft APR, the lead agency received helpful reviews from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTAC), the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO), and the North East Regional Resource Center (NERRC).

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
7/1/11- 6/30/12	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:

97%
<i>2% slippage – explanation and improvement activities included</i>

Using its statewide data system, Connecticut reviewed service data for ALL children with Individual Family Service Plans (IFSPs) on 12/1/11 that had at least one new service listed on the IFSP in effect on 12/1/11. 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	1074
b. Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received the new services on their IFSPs late due to a documented exceptional family circumstance	114
c. Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs that had at least one new service.	1224
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)	97%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

On 12/1/11 there were 4431 children with IFSPs in Part C. 1224 of those children had at least one new service listed on the IFSP that was in effect on 12/1/11. The families of 1074 children received all their new services in a timely manner (within 45 days from parent consent on the IFSP). An additional 114 children received the service(s) late due to a documented exceptional family circumstance beyond the control of the lead agency including Hurricane Irene in August 2011 and Winter Storm Alfred in October 2011. Those 114 were added to the numerator for a total of 1188 and kept in the denominator (1224).

While Connecticut did not reach its target and experienced slight slippage (2%), 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%), '09-'10 year (99%), and the '10-'11 year (99%).

There were only 36 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:

- 24 – 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 46-167 days),
- 10 – 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 (Range 47-113 days)
- 2 – due to emergency staff illnesses (Range 64-73 days)

In total there were 58 late services planned for the 36 children. Of the 58, 46 (79%) were only planned to occur monthly. Eleven (19%) were planned to occur weekly and one (2%) was planned to occur every other week. Connecticut has been focusing on reminding service providers that even monthly services must begin on time, which may mean scheduling them early in the 1st month after the IFSP meeting to allow time for rescheduling if needed.

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 36 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.

During the '11-'12 year, Connecticut had 43 comprehensive programs. The 36 children with at least one late service (not due to documented extraordinary family circumstances) were enrolled in 12 different programs. After verification of the data from 12/1/11, findings were issued to 11 of the 12 programs. One program was not issued a new finding because non-compliance with this measure had already been identified and it remained uncorrected. That finding has now been corrected (see below.)

Correction of '10-'11 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for '10-'11 for this indicator: **99%**

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY10(the period from July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2011)	5
2. Number of '10-'11 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)	4
3. Number of '10-'11 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	1

Correction of '10-'11 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

4. Number of '10-'11 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	1
5. Number of '10-'11 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	1
6. Number of '10-'11 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Verification of Correction of FFY 2010 noncompliance or FFY 2010 findings (either timely or subsequent):

The state verified correction for all 5 programs (range 9-20 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 sustained correction by May 23, 2012 which was one

year from identification (May 23, 2011). Correction was ultimately verified as of August 15, 2012 (20 months after identification) using a review of subsequent data verified by emails.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in the '10-'11 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 the '10-'11 APR, Connecticut accounted for all instances of noncompliance with the timely service provisions identified through the review of data from the statewide database 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

- 1) each program with noncompliance identified in '10-'11 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
- 2) each program was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, based on a review of subsequent data, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary."	The lead agency found that the noncompliance during the '11-'12 year was very limited (36/1224) and often due to individual errors as new staff learn the rules. Programs were reminded, using a bi-weekly newsletter, about using real-time reports from the database to track the timely initiation of new services.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY12 (July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013) (if applicable):

No revisions at this time.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2011

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.

FFY11	Measurable and Rigorous Target
7/1/11- 6/30/12	95%

Actual Target Data for FFY11 (July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012):

The information below is taken from the 618 setting tables submitted for children with IFSPs on December 1, 2011.

Primary Settings of Infants and Toddlers, Ages Birth Through 2	
(4354 + 72) / 4431 = 99%	
Total (Rows 1-3)	4431
1. Home	4354
2. Community-Based Settings	72
3. Other Settings	5

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY11 (July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012):

Pursuant to OSEP Memo 13-7, Connecticut is not required to report on progress/slippage or improvement activities for this Indicator for FFY 2011 because the state has met its target.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY12 (July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013) *[If applicable]*

No revisions at this time.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2011**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 = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes (use for FFY 2011-2012 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 = $\# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus } \# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in category (d) divided by } [\# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus } \# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus } \# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus } \# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d)}] \times 100$.

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 = $\# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus } \# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e) divided by the total } \# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)}] \times 100$.

Target Data and Actual Target Data for FFY2011 (July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012):

Out of the 4354 children who exited during the '11-'12 year, the families of 2621 had at least six months of Birth to Three services and supports between their first visit after the initial IFSP meeting and their exit date.

Two sets of Child Outcome Summary (COS) scores were entered into the statewide database for 2554 of the 2621 children (97.4%). The five progress categories listed in the Measurement box above were used to produce the two summary statements below for each outcome.

Summary Statements	Actual '10-'11 (% and # children)	Actual '11-'12 (% and # children)	Targets '11-'12 (% 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: $c+d / a+b+c+d$ (1570/2023)	83.1% (n=2476)	77.6% (n=2023)	84.7%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program. Formula: $d+e / a+b+c+d+e$ (1496/2554)	55.6% (n=2816)	58.6% (n=2554)	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: $c+d / a+b+c+d$ (1977/2344)	83.2% (n=2623)	84.3% (n=2344)	88.0%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they exited the program. Formula: $d+e / a+b+c+d+e$ (1292/2554)	53.8% (n=2816)	50.6% (n=2554)	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: $c+d / a+b+c+d$ (1803/2054)	88.8% (n=2515)	87.8% (n=2054)	88.5%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they exited the program. Formula: $d+e / a+b+c+d+e$ (1778/2554)	63.6% (n=2816)	69.6% (n=2554)	53.2%

APR Template – Part C (4)

Connecticut
State

These are the progress categories for each Outcome for children who exited in the '11-'12 year.

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Children who did not improve functioning	34	1%
b. Children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers	419	16%
c. Children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	605	24%
d. Children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	965	38%
e. Children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	531	21%
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	27	1%
b. Children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers	340	13%
c. Children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	895	35%
d. Children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1082	42%
e. Children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	210	8%
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Children who did not improve functioning	20	1%
b. Children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers	231	9%
c. Children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	525	21%
d. Children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1278	50%
e. Children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	500	20%
Total		N=2554 100%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY11 (July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012):

The state met its targets for two of the six summary statements, A2 and C2. The summary statements A1, B1, B2, and C1 did not meet the State targets. Three summary statements showed "progress" since the '10-'11 year (A2, B1, and C2) and the other three, "slippage" (A1, B2, and C1). A1, B2, and C1 also did not meet the State's targets and have been the focus of greater scrutiny. The state regularly runs pattern checks on the data by program but no consistent trends or reasons have become apparent since the new COS form was introduced.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY12 (July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013) [If applicable]

No revisions at this time. Connecticut will be reviewing its data during the '12-'13 year and most likely proposing to revise its baseline and targets in the next [State Performance Plan](#).

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2011

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

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

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

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# 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.
- 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.
- 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.

FFY11	Measurable and Rigorous Target
7/1/11-6/30/12	4A) 83% 4B) 80% 4C) 91%

Actual Target Data for FFY11 (July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012):

2012 Family Outcomes	N=1025
4A (know my rights)	84.5% (866)
CI at 95% CL	82.3% – 86.7%
SD / Standard Error	36.2% / 1.1%
4B (communicate about my child)	82.7% (848)
CI at 95% CL	80.4% - 85.1%
SD / Standard Error	37.8% / 1.1%
4C (help me help my child)	92.3% (946)
CI at 95% CL	90.7% - 93.9%
SD / Standard Error	26.7% / 0.83%

APR Template – Part C (4)

Connecticut
State

Using a census model and the same method for delivering and obtaining the surveys as last year (in person), 2073 surveys were given out and 1039 surveys were returned. This return rate of 50.2% is higher than each previous year. Of the 1039 returned, 1025 were complete enough to be usable in the Rasch analysis.

When the race/ ethnicity and gender of the response pool were compared to the survey census state rates and the state child count data (Table 1 from Section 618 of IDEA), the response pool was determined to be representative:

	Section 618 of IDEA Table 1		Surveys Sent Out Using Census		Survey Response Pool	
Total	4431	12/1/2011	2073	2/1/2012	1025	9/1/2012
1. Hispanic/Latino	1272	29%	618	30%	309	30%
2. American Indian Or Alaska Native	14	0%	6	0%	2	0%
3. Asian	125	3%	51	2%	30	3%
4. Black Or African American	496	11%	232	11%	101	10%
5. Native Hawaiian Or Other Pacific Islander	21	0%	8	0%	4	0%
6. White	2414	54%	1118	54%	558	54%
7. Two Or More Races	89	2%	40	2%	21	2%
Boys	2930	66%	1347	65%	675	66%
Girls	1501	34%	726	35%	350	34%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

Pursuant to OSEP Memo 13-7, Connecticut is not required to report on progress/slippage or improvement activities for this Indicator for FFY 2011 because the state has met its targets.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY12 (July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013) *[If applicable]*

No revisions at this time.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2011

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.

FFY11	Measurable and Rigorous Target
7/1/11- 6/30/12	1.20%

Actual Target Data for FFY11 (July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012):

Below is part of the 618 table submitted for children with IFSPs on December 1, 2011.

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	4431	467	37,318	1.25%

When compared to national data, Connecticut ranks 19th among all the states and territories.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY11 (July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012):

Pursuant to OSEP Memo 13-7, Connecticut is not required to report on progress/slippage or improvement activities for this Indicator for FFY 2011 because the state has met its target.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY12 (July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013) [If applicable]

As Connecticut's Result's Topic, the [State Performance Plan](#) (direct link to Birth23.org > How are we doing?) has been revised and new improvement strategies have been proposed.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2011**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.

FFY11	Measurable and Rigorous Target
7/1/11-6/30/12	3.19%

Actual Target Data for FFY11 (July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012):

Below is part of the 618 table submitted for children with IFSPs on December 1, 2011.

A.1. AGE AND RACE/ETHNICITY OF INFANTS AND TODDLERS, AGES BIRTH THROUGH 2			
	Total	Census Population 0+1+2*	Percent of Population
TOTAL	4431	114,569	3.87%

When compared to national data, Connecticut ranks 10th among the 50 states and is above the national average.**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY11 (July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012):**

Pursuant to OSEP Memo 13-7, Connecticut is not required to report on progress/slippage or improvement activities for this Indicator for FFY 2011 because the state has met its target.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY12 (July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013) [If applicable]

No revisions at this time.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2011

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)

Measurement:

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.

Account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
7/1/11-6/30/12	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:

100.0%

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.	3725
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)	625
c. Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted.	4351
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)	100.0%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2011:

Pursuant to OSEP Memo 13-7, Connecticut is not required to report on progress/slippage or improvement activities for this Indicator for FFY 2011 because the state has met its target.

While the State has technically met its target using data taken to the tenth of a percent which was the guidance given to states early on by the previous MSIP Director, Ruth Ryder and again on a TA call on December 19, 2012, there was one child with a delayed initial IFSP meeting because the family asked that the program reconsider the outcome of the eligibility evaluation that had determined that the child was not eligible. The program sent out staff to do additional testing with the *Preschool Language Scale* to verify the initial determination made using the *Battelle Developmental Inventory* and the determination was changed to eligible based on a speech concern. The family's IFSP meeting was ultimately held, although late (79 days from referral).

The one case of child specific "non-compliance" above was corrected on October 14, 2011 and based on subsequent data there was no new non-compliance by that program during the rest of the year.

Correction of '10-'11 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for '10-'11 for this indicator: 99 %

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during '10-'11 (the period from July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2011)	3
2. Number of '10-'11 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	3
3. Number of '10-'11 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Verification of Correction of FFY 2010 noncompliance or FFY 2010 findings (either timely or subsequent):

The state verified timely correction for all three programs using updated data from the statewide data system with email verification.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010:

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 '10-'11 APR, Connecticut accounted for all instances of noncompliance with the timely initial IFSP provisions identified through the review of data from the statewide database 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

- 1) each program with noncompliance identified in the '10-'11 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 and
- 2) each program was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, based on a review of subsequent data, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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 2012 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary."	Taken out to 1/10th of 1 percent, Connecticut's data results in 100.0%.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY12 (July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013) (if applicable):

No revisions at this time.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2011

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.

FFY11	Measurable and Rigorous Target
7/1/11- 6/30/12	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY11 (July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012):

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	4354
b. Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP	4354
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 and verified using a variety of general supervision components including monitoring and complaints

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2011:

Pursuant to OSEP Memo 13-7, Connecticut is not required to report on progress/slippage or improvement activities for this Indicator for FFY 2011 because the state has met its target.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY12 (July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013) (if applicable):

No revisions at this time.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Same as described under Indicator #1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition**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:B Notification to LEA, 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 notification to the LEA occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
7/1/11- 6/30/12	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:

100%

Since 2010, using its statewide database, the lead agency has been exporting notification data to the State Department of Education (SDE). 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. During 'the 11-'12 year data was sent for 3967 children who were over age 2 ½ and still enrolled in Birth to Three and therefore may have been eligible for preschool special education. The exports were completed in August 2011, December 2011, and April 2012.

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	3967
b. Number of children exiting Part C who may have been eligible for Part B	3967
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 2011:

Pursuant to OSEP Memo 13-7, Connecticut is not required to report on progress/slippage or improvement activities for this Indicator for FFY 2011 because the state has met its target.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY12 (July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013) (if applicable):

No revisions at this time

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2011**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
7/1/11-6/30/12	100%

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

99%

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 7/1/11 and 6/30/12.

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.	2083
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 89-7 days with 7 not held at all because the child turned 3 before the conference could be held)	166
c. Number of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B and for whom a transition conference was due to occur.	2271
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)	99%

Connecticut has 4615 children in the Birth to Three database with a date of birth that would have them turn age three between 7/1/11 and 6/30/12.

- ~ 3251 of those children exited during the reporting year (the others exited before 7/1/11).
- ~ 2784 of those children exited Birth to Three because they turned three years old.
- ~ Of the 2784 children that exited at age three between 7/1/11 and 6/30/12, none were referred to Birth to Three fewer than 45 days before age three.
- ~ 89 children were referred between 45 and 90 days before age three.
- ~ The families of 292 of the remaining 2695 children did not provide approval for a transition conference with their district prior to 90 days before age three.
- ~ The families of an additional 132 children provided approval for a transition conference with their district less than one week before the 90 day deadline.

Stakeholders in Connecticut determined that families, service coordinators, and school districts would require at least one week to schedule a conference. The families of 128 of the 132 children ultimately had transition conferences (Range 89-1 days before age three) and the remaining four reached age three prior to the conference being held. The 424 records (292 + 132) were not included the numerator or the denominator.

For the purpose of this APR measurement, “potentially eligible” in Connecticut means that the child was still eligible and enrolled in 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 convening a transition conference.

As a result, 2271 children were determined to be potentially eligible for preschool special education during the ‘11-’12 year for the purpose of this APR measure. Based on verification emails, transition conferences for 166 families were held late or were not held at all prior to the children turning age three due to documented extraordinary family circumstances. These 166 were included in the numerator and the denominator.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in ‘11-’12:

While Connecticut did not meet its target, the state demonstrated progress since the ‘10-’11 year from 98% to 99% and continues to demonstrate very high levels of compliance.

The reasons for the 22 late conferences were as follows: (from 16 out of 43 programs)

- 17 – 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 hold a transition conference with the school district. (Range 87-42 days).
- 5 – due to staff errors in scheduling or staff illness. (Range 88-74 days)

Correction of ‘10-’11 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for ‘10-’11 for this indicator: 98 %

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during ‘10-’11 (the period from July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2011)	0
2. Number of ‘10-’11 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	0
3. Number of ‘10-’11 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Verification of Correction of '10-'11 noncompliance or '10-'11 findings (either timely or subsequent):

Using its statewide database Connecticut verifies when all conferences are held included any that are late. The lead agency also verifies that any cases of missing transition conferences are in fact held if the family has not already exited Birth to Three. All reasons for any late conferences or any not held prior to the family exiting Birth to Three are documented using data verification emails, records reviews and phone calls. Through this dual approach Connecticut verifies that every child that is potentially eligible for Part B either has a transition conference or is no longer under the jurisdiction of Part C.

There were no findings issued during the '10-'11 year.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010:

This is a timeline specific measure so late conferences or missing conferences identified after the child turned age 3 could not be corrected retroactively. Data for this is run annually and all of the programs with late conferences in the '10-'11 year had no late or missing conferences before the findings letters were issued and for a period of at least 3 months. This demonstrated both child specific and systemic correction.

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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary."	The lead agency found that the noncompliance during the '11-'12 year was very limited (22 / 2271). Most were due to the challenges faced when a child is referred within 135 days of age three. The rest were often due to individual errors as new staff learn the rules.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY12 (July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013) (if applicable):

No revisions at this time.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2011**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).

FFY11	Measurable and Rigorous Target
7/1/11- 6/30/12	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 FFY11 (Findings made between July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011):

89% (54/61 Findings)
2% Slippage – Explanation and Improvement Activities Included

The worksheet required for this indicator is attached as Appendix A.

Describe the process for selecting EIS programs for Monitoring:

Connecticut monitors all programs on the four APR measures once per year using data from the statewide data system combined with a data accuracy verification process completed via email. During the '10-'11 year each experienced program completed a new self-assessment and findings were issued. Experienced programs are those that have a long history of onsite monitoring visits and had each already completed two previous self-assessments (formerly called Biennial Performance Reports). While all the programs reported timely correction, the correction of the self-assessment findings for two programs could not be verified based on onsite data verification visits. This resulted in several extended timelines for correction.

APR Template – Part C (4)

Connecticut
State

EIS Program	Date Finding Identified	APR Data	Complaint	Fiscal Audit	Focused Monitoring	Onsite Record Review	Self Assessment	Grand Total
General comprehensive program	03-Sep-10						1	1
	01-Mar-11				1			1
Hearing specialty program	08-Sep-10						3	3
General comprehensive program	03-Sep-10						1	1
General comprehensive program	03-Sep-10						1	1
General comprehensive program	15-Aug-10					6		6
Hearing specialty program	02-Sep-10						1	1
General comprehensive program	08-Sep-10						1	1
	23-May-11	1						1
General comprehensive program	03-Sep-10						3	3
General comprehensive program	03-Nov-10	1						1
	23-May-11	1						1
General comprehensive program	08-Sep-10						3	3
General comprehensive program	29-Oct-10					1		1
	29-Mar-11		3					3
	27-Apr-11			1				1
Autism specific program	08-Apr-11				1			1
General comprehensive program	08-Sep-10						2	2
General comprehensive program	02-Sep-10						2	2
	23-May-11	1						1
General comprehensive program	03-Sep-10						2	2
	03-Nov-10	1						1
General comprehensive program	03-Sep-10						1	1
General comprehensive program	10-Aug-10					6		6
General comprehensive program	02-Sep-10						1	1
General comprehensive program	08-Sep-10						3	3
	03-Nov-10	1						1
General comprehensive program	03-Sep-10						1	1
Hearing specialty program	08-Sep-10						3	3
General comprehensive program	02-Sep-10						1	1
General comprehensive program	03-Sep-10						1	1
	23-May-11	1						1
General comprehensive program	03-Sep-10						2	2
	23-May-11	1						1
General comprehensive program	08-Sep-10						1	1
Grand total		8	3	1	2	13	34	61

Corrective Action Plans (CAPs) were developed for all programs when the lead agency could not verify the correction of identified non-compliance within one year of the finding. A CAP is the second tier in Connecticut's levels of improvement and is more stringent than the

Improvement Plans (IPs) that programs follow during the first 12 months after a finding is identified.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2011:

Connecticut experienced slippage and did not meet its target for during the '11-'12 year for verifying the timely correction of findings made during the '10-'11 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. During the '10-'11 year 91% of 70 findings were verified as corrected in a timely manner.

All written findings of child-specific and/or systemic noncompliance sent to a local program on or before 6/30/11 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.

The lead agency reviewed and revised procedures in place to remind programs about pending deadlines for timely correction. The Accountability and Monitoring data tracking module was updated and reports were added to the web-based data system to help the lead agency and programs track and verify the timely correction noncompliance.

During the '11-'12 year the lead agency published RFPs for all contracted programs. Thirty-four General comprehensive program proposals were reviewed and 29 were selected. Nineteen Autism specific program proposals were reviewed and six were selected. Three Hearing specialty program proposals were reviewed and all three were selected.

Through this comprehensive review and re-contracting process, Connecticut increased the number of families being served by programs with proposals that received high ratings. Programs with lower ratings received smaller contracts and four were not awarded contracts for new referrals after 6/30/12. It is anticipated that this one all-encompassing effort on the part of the lead agency during the '11-'12 year will have a large impact on compliance and the quality of services provided to families in Connecticut. Two programs are new to Connecticut and will be monitored closely.

During the '11-'12 year, since lead agency staff were preparing the RFP, reviewing proposals and writing new contracts, no focused monitoring visits were made. No self-assessments were required of programs as they were writing proposals. The lead agency continued to monitor programs using APR data, complaints, and other desk audit activities. On-site visits were completed to 3 programs. As a result, only 48 findings were identified during the '11-'12 year and having this low of a number in the denominator will have an impact on the overall percent.

In November 2011 OSEP visited Connecticut to complete a continuous improvement visit. The report is available online at <http://www2.ed.gov/fund/data/report/idea/partcvltr/index.html#ct> and Connecticut is very proud of the results.

Timely Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2010 (the period from July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2011) (Sum of Column a on the Indicator C 9 Worksheet)	61
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)	54
3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	7

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

4. Number of FFY 2010 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	7
5. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	7
6. Number of FFY 2010 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Verification of Correction of findings during the '10-'11 year (either timely or subsequent)

For the 54 findings that were verified as corrected in a timely manner, 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

- 1) each program with noncompliance identified in '10-'11 has corrected all individual cases of non-compliance unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the Birth to Three program and
- 2) each program was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, based on a review of subsequent data, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction in the '11-'12 year of findings of noncompliance identified during the '10-'11 year:

All noncompliance identified during the '10-'11 year was either verified as corrected in a timely manner or subsequently verified as corrected as of August 15, 2012 (Range 14-20 months).

The seven findings that were corrected more than one year from identification were issued to four programs.

Corrective Action Plans (CAP) were developed with all of the four programs highlighting required objectives, timelines, and people responsible as well as sanctions.

Two of the four programs with CAPs were hearing specialty programs and correction (four of the seven findings) was ultimately verified using a combination of multiple on-site visits, secure faxing of required documents, and reviewing updated data system reports.

The third program with a CAP was a relatively new general comprehensive program and they elected to cancel their contract with the lead agency when not selected for a full term contract as part of the re-bidding of all the program contracts. All child specific non-compliance was corrected and all the families in that program were successfully moved to programs that did not have improvement plans or corrective action plans in plans. (two of the seven findings)

Correction was verified for the one remaining finding at the one remaining experienced general comprehensive program based on updated data reports demonstrating 100% compliance for a minimum of three consecutive months.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY12 (July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013) (if applicable):

A new improvement strategy is proposed in the revised [State Performance Plan \(SPP\)](#) due to slippage. The lead agency will evaluate the timing of verifying the correction of findings made based on self-assessments only.

Lead agency staff will remind programs earlier about correction that is coming due.

NOTE: Pursuant to OSEP Memorandum 13-7, with the accompanying Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) Part C Indicator Measurement Table and Instructions, Indicators 10 (Complaints) and 11 (Due Process Hearings) have been deleted from the SPP/APR, effective with the FFY 2011 submission of the APR. Data related to these two indicators are reported in November to the Department of Education Office of Special Education as part of reporting required under Section 618 of the IDEA. This data may be found at: <https://www.ideadata.org/PartCData.asp>.

The next Indicator is Indicator 12.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2011**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.

FFY11	Measurable and Rigorous Target
7/1/11- 6/30/12	NA

Actual Target Data for FFY11 (July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012):

NA – Does not apply because Part C did not adopt Part B due process procedures

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY11 (July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012):

NA

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY12 (July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013) *[If applicable]*

NA

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2011**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 = $[(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) \text{ divided by } 2.1] \text{ times } 100$.

FFY11	Measurable and Rigorous Target
7/1/11- 6/30/12	NA

Actual Target Data for FFY11 (July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012):

0%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY11 (July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012):

There was one mediation request not related to a due process complaint during the '11-'12 year. The mediation was held and did not result in an agreement.

Connecticut's [State Performance Plan](#) target for this indicator is NA because states are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than ten per year and Connecticut has never had more than five in one year in the history of Part C (and Part H) of the IDEA.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY12 (July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013) [If applicable]

No revisions at this time.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2011**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.

FFY11	Measurable and Rigorous Target
7/1/11- 6/30/12	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY11 (July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012):

100%

The required data rubric for this indicator will be completed by OSEP. Connecticut is confident that 100% is accurate for this indicator.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY11 (July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012):

The lead agency will review and respond to OSEP's calculation of Connecticut's data on this indicator when it is received from OSEP. Discussion of progress/slippage and improvement activities, if required, will be included after OSEP calculation has been reviewed.

Detailed information about the actions Connecticut takes to ensure compliance is included throughout the [State Performance Plan](#), including a description of Connecticut's mechanisms for ensuring error-free, consistent, valid and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met. Please note that targets for timeliness and accuracy are 100%.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY12 (July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013) [If applicable]

No revisions at this time

Attachment A
INDICATOR C-9 WORKSHEET

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 through 6/30/11)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 through 6/30/11)	(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	16	20	18
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	1	1	1
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	0	0	0
	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	5	6	6
	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)

Connecticut
State

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 through 6/30/11)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 through 6/30/11)	(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	7	5
	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	10	10
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	1	1	1
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	3	3	3
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0

APR Template – Part C (4)

Connecticut
State

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 through 6/30/11)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 through 6/30/11)	(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	9	12	9
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	1	1	1
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b			61	54

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