

# STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART C

for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

For reporting on  
FFY 2019

Connecticut



**PART C DUE**  
**February 1, 2021**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

## Introduction

### Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and to ensure that the Lead Agency (LA) meets the requirements of Part C of the IDEA. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

### Intro - Indicator Data

#### Executive Summary

The Office of Early Childhood (OEC) is the state agency in Connecticut that is referred to as the "lead agency" for Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) or Birth to Three. During the year from 7/1/19 through 6/30/20, the OEC had contracts with a central intake office and 28 agencies to provide comprehensive Early Intervention Services (EIS). During this fiscal year, the OEC sent out a Request for Proposals (RFP) leading to new comprehensive EIS program contracts with 19 of the 28 existing programs beginning on 7/1/20.

All referrals are received by the state's central intake office called 211 Child Development or 211CD. Staff at 211CD describe the Birth to Three System of supports for families, and as appropriate, any related family cost participation fees. The intake and any additional records for families that agree to have a Birth to Three evaluation are sent electronically to one of the EIS programs that serve the town where they live. Programs are required to complete all aspects of supporting families from referral through when the family exits Birth to Three.

In combination with clear procedures, statewide forms, technical assistance, a centralized transactional database, and positive, trusting working relationships, these contracts allow the lead agency to verify that EIS programs consistently achieve high levels of compliance with the IDEA and positive outcomes for families and their children.

#### Additional information related to data collection and reporting

#### General Supervision System

**The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part C requirements are met, e.g., monitoring systems, dispute resolution systems.**

General supervision for Part C in Connecticut includes all of the sections described in this introduction and other components such as policies and procedures, fiscal management, risk rubrics, and data on processes and results. The monitoring and dispute resolution components are integrated and include multiple mechanisms to identify and correct noncompliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and state requirements. Connecticut's general supervision system is comprised of universal, focused, and intensive activities.

Universal Activities: The lead agency conducts several annual general supervision activities for each EIS program to monitor the implementation of the IDEA and identify possible areas of noncompliance and low performance. The annual activities include:

1. Collection and verification of data for the SPP/APR compliance and results from indicators;
2. Public Reporting of APR data;
3. Determinations about how local programs are meeting the requirements of the IDEA; and
4. New in FFY19-20 Risk rubrics and required TA plans.

Other activities are completed on a cyclical basis, such as program self-assessments resulting in improvement plans with timelines for correction and fiscal monitoring that addresses the use of federal and state funds and the timeliness and accuracy of billing the lead agency, parents, and third-party payers. Finally, the state reissues Requests For Proposals (RFPs) every 5-7 years, which can help bring in new programs and increase the capacity and coverage for those with the best applications while reducing or eliminating those that do not stay current with evidence-based practices in early intervention.

Targeted Activities: Focused Monitoring is a critical component of Connecticut's system of general supervision and may include off-site activities such as desk audits or an in-depth review of available data, on-site monitoring activities such as file reviews, interviews with families and staff, and additional activities as determined necessary based on the identified issues. Reports include findings of noncompliance as well as strengths and areas that need improvement. The lead agency ensures the timely resolution of disputes related to the IDEA requirements through various means, including mediation, complaint investigation, and due process hearings. The effectiveness of dispute resolution is evaluated regularly, and issues are tracked to determine whether patterns or trends exist. This analysis is useful for prioritizing monitoring and technical assistance activities and for making changes to policies and procedures as needed.

Intensive Activities: Intensive activities may be necessary based on issues identified through general or focused monitoring activities, complaints, or analysis of data in the statewide database. Activities include on-site visits, targeted family and staff interviews, and required technical assistance.

Identification of Noncompliance: Both systemic and child-specific noncompliance with state and federal regulatory requirements can be identified at all levels. All noncompliance is identified to the program in writing and the details to support the finding (e.g., the measure, actual percentages, regulatory references). As part of the notification of findings of noncompliance, programs are informed that all systemic noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from the date of the written notification. For child-specific noncompliance, the evidence needed to verify correction is described and includes a timeline for correction that is usually between 2-3 weeks. For systemic noncompliance, programs are encouraged to develop an improvement plan with timelines for correction and to report progress and correction prior to the one-year deadline.

#### Technical Assistance System:

**The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to early intervention service (EIS) programs.**

The Lead Agency (LA) team works with staff and contractors dedicated to Technical Assistance (TA).

The LA also has a relationship with the University of Connecticut Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities (UCEDD) and a parent leadership contract with the state's Parent Training and Information Center (PTI). With assistance from the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC), parents are regularly included in providing TA. The UCEDD and LA staff provide an intensive year-long course on best practices in early intervention, including family-centered practices, evaluation and assessment, and intervention planning. While this course is part of the PD system, it also provides direct, timely technical assistance to participants based on the review of competencies they submit related to their work with families. The need for TA can be identified in the following ways:

- Risk Rubric,
- Staff or program request,

- As a result of program monitoring/self-assessment,
- Based on a complaint received by the system,
- Changes to policies or procedures, and
- Literature about evidence-based and promising practices.

TA topics include but are not limited to:

- Fiscal and insurance billing,
- Coaching methods,
- Natural Learning Environment Practices (NLEP),
- Using a primary provider approach,
- Supporting families in crisis,
- Using the data system and reporting tools, and
- Adherence to Connecticut Birth to Three System policies and procedures.

The lead agency offers follow-up support after 3-4 months to answer questions that arise. In addition to TA provided by lead agency staff and the UCEDD, the system has contracted with Dathan Rush and M'Lisa Shelden for the past 7 years to provide monthly TA for up to 15 multi-disciplinary teams for a period of six to nine months each year. This TA addresses evidence-based practices in Early Intervention (called Activity-Based Teaming in CT). An evaluation follows each TA session so programs can rate the lead agency on the TA response's timeliness, the quality of the materials presented, and how the desired outcomes were met. The primary focus of TA in this reporting period has been Activity-Based Teaming (ABT). To learn more about ABT, visit [Birth23.org/aboutb23/lookslike/](http://Birth23.org/aboutb23/lookslike/).

Linda Bamonte presented the Early Childhood Research to Practice Division at OSEP on evidence-based practices for Early Intervention in Connecticut. The presentation included an overview of evidence-based practices for Early intervention in Connecticut and a detailed look at the implementation strategies and process for scaling up these practices over the past 7 years.

#### **Professional Development System:**

**The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.**

A quality practice self-assessment (QPSA) was developed to monitor the program's implementation of evidence-based practices as part of the State's SSIP (see Indicator 11). Program directors receive the results of their staff's self-assessment and then develop a plan for their agency to improve service delivery. Results are available to the State to monitor year-to-year change by the program. The lead agency expects to see that the program's "quality" improves from year-to-year. At the beginning of each fiscal year, the lead agency sends out the results to programs. The lead agency has offered training and technical assistance for five cohorts on natural learning environment practices, coaching, and primary service provider. Following the training, providers receive 6-9 months of technical assistance in the form of coaching log reviews. Each log is reviewed, focusing on the types of questions asked, the joint plan's adequacy, use of activities versus focus on skills, capacity building and use of modeling observation, etc. These points are used to determine an individual provider's fidelity. The lead agency maintains a list of those who have reached fidelity as well as those who have done additional logs and training to be considered a "Master Coach." Koleen Kerski became a second Fidelity Coach for Connecticut's Early Intervention system as outlined in Linda Bamonte's presentation to OSEP.

The lead agency partners with the University Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities to present the Early Intervention Specialist course. The course coordinators work closely with the lead agency to present current best practice research and practical application to their work with families. This course changes the way people practice, describes an early intervention to families and ensures that they are working to increase the family's capacity to meet their child's needs.

In August 2020, the State rolled out the first cohort of the OSEP/OSERS leadership grant (84.325L), which works to build upon leaders' capacity throughout the Birth to Three and Preschool Special Education system. The first cohort includes 16 scholars who attend the class for five hours per week via Zoom, which covers Early Childhood competencies and pedagogy. Additionally, the scholars are equipped to roll out a project over the next year to make a difference in their local system.

In September 2020, the LA was awarded the OSEP/OSERS recruitment and retention grant (84.325P). The purpose of this grant is to address CT identified needs for retention and recruitment of early intervention (EI) and early childhood special education (ECSE) to work with infants and young children with disabilities and their families; and ensure that that person has the necessary skills and knowledge, derived from practices that have been determined through scientifically based research, to be successful leaders in programs serving such children. Doing so by revising the State's Infant Toddler Family Specialist (ITFS) course, providing support to master coaches, and collecting workforce data to identify the reasons individuals leave early intervention.

#### **Stakeholder Involvement:**

**The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP/APR, and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 11, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

This Annual Performance Report (APR) of the State Performance Plan (SPP) was developed with broad stakeholder input. At a State Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) meeting in December 2020, the members reviewed results from FFY19 (7/1/19-6/30/20) for each indicator. As entered into the online submission tool, a draft PDF of the APR was posted on the Birth to Three website, [www.Birth23.org](http://www.Birth23.org), in December 2020. The link was sent to the PTI, CPAC, Inc., and several national technical assistance (TA) centers, including DaSy, and the ECTA Center, whose staff reviewed the draft and provided helpful guidance. Access to EMAPS was given directly to several State ICC members who reviewed the file in detail, asked questions, and suggested edits. Leadership from the OEC also reviewed the APR and made suggestions. The ICC approved the final edits so that this Annual Performance Report (APR) fulfills the State Interagency Coordinating Council's obligations to report to the U.S. Department of Education in the current fiscal year (see attached certification).

#### **Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part C results indicators (y/n)**

YES

#### **Reporting to the Public:**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2018 performance of each EIS Program located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2018 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2018 APR in 2020, is available.**

The FFY18 performance of each EIS program was posted at <https://www.birth23.org/how-are-we-doing/pr/> in February 2020. The FFY19 performance of each EIS program will overwrite last year's data at <https://www.birth23.org/how-are-we-doing/pr/> when posted in February 2021.

**Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**Intro - OSEP Response**

**Intro - Required Actions**

# Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

## Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Family Service Plans (IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Include the State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

### 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.

### Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select early intervention service (EIS) programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. States report in both the numerator and denominator under Indicator 1 on the number of children for whom the State ensured the timely initiation of new services identified on the IFSP. Include the timely initiation of new early intervention services from both initial IFSPs and subsequent IFSPs. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

The State's timeliness measure for this indicator must be either: (1) a time period that runs from when the parent consents to IFSP services; or (2) the IFSP initiation date (established by the IFSP Team, including the parent).

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in the Office of Special Education Programs' (OSEP's) response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	97.40%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.49%	98.97%	99.65%	99.88%	100.00%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
3,057	3,130	100.00%	100%	99.62%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances**

*This number will be added to the "Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.*

61

**Include your State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).**

Timely are those new EI services that are planned to start within 45 days and are in fact initiated within 45 days of the IFSP meeting when the parent signed the plan consenting to the services as written.

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.**

Using 12/1/19 as a point in time is representative of the reporting period because it is the same date used for Indicators 2, 5, and 6 in this report. Even though the source of the data is the State Database, the state was asked to report the source of this data as "State Monitoring" because the state is only monitoring a point in time. However, all EIS programs were monitored at the same time using the data in the state database.

**If needed, provide additional information about this indicator here.**

Using 12/1/19 as a point in time is representative of the reporting period because it is the same date used for Indicators 2, 5, and 6 in this report. Even though the source of the data is the State Database, the state was asked to report the source of this data as "State Monitoring" because the state is only monitoring a point in time. However, all EIS programs were monitored at the same time using the data in the state database.

During FFY19, twelve instances of noncompliance were identified at four programs. This is an indicator with a timeline. The individual cases of late new services could not be corrected. In each case where the new service data was missing, the state verified, using the statewide database, emails and phone calls with local programs, that the new service was ultimately provided or that the family exited Birth to Three before the new service could be started. A finding letter was sent to one of the four programs as the other three programs were not awarded a new contract as a result of the statewide RFP.

As this FFY19 APR is the subsequent year to FFY18, in FFY18 the state did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**1 - OSEP Response**

**1 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Results indicator:** 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)

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

**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.

**Instructions**

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's 618 data reported in Table 2. If not, explain.

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	99.60%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target>=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Data	99.98%	99.96%	99.98%	99.98%	100.00%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target>=	95.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

This Annual Performance Report (APR) of the State Performance Plan (SPP) was developed with broad stakeholder input. At a State Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) meeting in December 2020, the members reviewed results from FFY19 (7/1/19-6/30/20) for each indicator. As entered into the online submission tool, a draft PDF of the APR was posted on the Birth to Three website, [www.Birth23.org](http://www.Birth23.org), in December 2020. The link was sent to the PTI, CPAC, Inc., and several national technical assistance (TA) centers, including DaSy, and the ECTA Center, whose staff reviewed the draft and provided helpful guidance. Access to EMAPS was given directly to several State ICC members who reviewed the file in detail, asked questions, and suggested edits. Leadership from the OEC also reviewed the APR and made suggestions. The ICC approved the final edits so that this Annual Performance Report (APR) fulfills the State Interagency Coordinating Council's obligations to report to the U.S. Department of Education in the current fiscal year (see attached certification).

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/08/2020	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	5,744
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/08/2020	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	5,746

### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of Infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
5,744	5,746	100.00%	95.00%	99.97%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**2 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**2 - OSEP Response**

**2 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Results indicator:** 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)

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

#### Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

##### Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

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

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

##### Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

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

#### Instructions

**Sampling of infants and toddlers with IFSPs** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement, include in the numerator and denominator only infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Report: (1) the number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's Part C exiting data under Section 618 of the IDEA; and (2) the number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements.

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Process (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

If the State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i), the State must report data in two ways. First, it must report on all eligible children but exclude its at-risk infants and toddlers (i.e., include just those infants and toddlers experiencing developmental delay (or "developmentally delayed children") or having a diagnosed physical or mental condition that has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay (or "children with diagnosed conditions")). Second, the State must separately report outcome data on either: (1) just its at-risk infants and toddlers; or (2) aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C (including developmentally delayed children, children with diagnosed conditions, and at-risk infants and toddlers).

### 3 - Indicator Data

Does your State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? (yes/no)

NO

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

This Annual Performance Report (APR) of the State Performance Plan (SPP) was developed with broad stakeholder input. At a State Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) meeting in December 2020, the members reviewed results from FFY19 (7/1/19-6/30/20) for each indicator. As entered into the online submission tool, a draft PDF of the APR was posted on the Birth to Three website, www.Birth23.org, in December 2020. The link was sent to the PTI, CPAC, Inc., and several national technical assistance (TA) centers, including DaSy, and the ECTA Center, whose staff reviewed the draft and provided helpful guidance. Access to EMAPS was given directly to several State ICC members who reviewed the file in detail, asked questions, and suggested edits. Leadership from the OEC also reviewed the APR and made suggestions. The ICC approved the final edits so that this Annual Performance Report (APR) fulfills the State Interagency Coordinating Council's obligations to report to the U.S. Department of Education in the current fiscal year (see attached certification).

#### Historical Data

Outcome	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A1	2013	Target>=	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%	73.00%
A1	72.77%	Data	74.03%	73.69%	73.56%	74.83%	73.80%
A2	2013	Target>=	59.00%	59.00%	59.00%	59.00%	60.00%
A2	59.60%	Data	60.05%	59.61%	60.90%	60.17%	60.21%
B1	2013	Target>=	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	83.00%
B1	82.75%	Data	82.50%	82.79%	83.53%	80.87%	80.57%
B2	2013	Target>=	52.00%	52.00%	52.00%	52.00%	53.00%
B2	50.95%	Data	51.95%	51.31%	52.72%	51.82%	52.90%
C1	2014	Target>=	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	84.00%
C1	83.65%	Data	83.65%	83.70%	85.69%	84.41%	84.86%
C2	2014	Target>=	65.00%	65.00%	65.00%	65.00%	72.00%
C2	72.05%	Data	71.13%	71.49%	74.20%	71.36%	72.04%

#### Targets

FFY	2019
Target A1>=	73.00%
Target A2>=	60.00%
Target B1>=	83.00%
Target B2>=	53.00%
Target C1>=	84.00%
Target C2>=	73.00%

#### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

3,288

#### Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	92	2.80%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	565	17.18%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	778	23.66%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,058	32.18%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	795	24.18%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. 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 turned 3 years of age or exited the program	1,836	2,493	73.80%	73.00%	73.65%	Met Target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	1,853	3,288	60.21%	60.00%	56.36%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable**

Slippage occurred due to the public health emergency (PHE) of COVID-19. Families were under extreme stress, and the system experienced a significant decrease in the number of children referred and enrolled as well as a decline in the number of children who were at age level when they exited. The families who called Birth to Three during the PHE are those with the greatest concerns about their child's development and those with children who have diagnosed conditions that automatically make them eligible. These children are less likely to maintain age level functioning or reach age level before exiting Part C.

**Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)**

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	66	2.01%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	561	17.06%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,106	33.64%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,255	38.17%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	300	9.12%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. 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 turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,361	2,988	80.57%	83.00%	79.02%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	1,555	3,288	52.90%	53.00%	47.29%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable**

Slippage occurred due to the public health emergency of COVID-19. Families were under extreme stress, and the system experienced a significant decrease in the number of children referred and enrolled as well as a decline in the number of children who substantially increased their rate of growth. The families who called Birth to Three during the PHE are those with the greatest concerns about their child's development and those with children who have diagnosed conditions that automatically make them eligible. These children are less likely to increase their rate of growth substantially.

**Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable**

Slippage occurred due to the public health emergency of COVID-19. Families were under extreme stress, and the system experienced a significant decrease in the number of children referred and enrolled as well as a decline in the number of children who were at age level when they exited. The families who called Birth to Three during the PHE are those with the greatest concerns about their child's development and those with children who have diagnosed conditions that automatically make them eligible. These children are less likely to maintain age level functioning or reach age level before exiting Part C.

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	53	1.61%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	419	12.74%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	604	18.37%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,412	42.94%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	800	24.33%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. 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 turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,016	2,488	84.86%	84.00%	81.03%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2,212	3,288	72.04%	73.00%	67.27%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable**

Slippage occurred due to the public health emergency of COVID-19. Families were under extreme stress, and the system experienced a significant decrease in the number of children referred and enrolled as well as a decline in the number of children who substantially increased their rate of growth. The families who called Birth to Three during the PHE are those with the greatest concerns about their child's development and those with children who have diagnosed conditions that automatically make them eligible. These children are less likely to increase their rate of growth substantially.

**Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable**

Slippage occurred due to the public health emergency of COVID-19. Families were under extreme stress, and the system experienced a significant decrease in the number of children referred and enrolled as well as a decline in the number of children who were at age level when they exited. The families who called Birth to Three during the PHE are those with the greatest concerns about their child's development and those with children who have diagnosed conditions that automatically make them eligible. These children are less likely to maintain age level functioning or reach age level before exiting Part C.

**The number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.**

Question	Number
The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's part C exiting 618 data	5,673
The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.	1,544

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

YES

**List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.**

The instruments used to gather data for this indicator include the Carolina, HELP, AEPS and procedures are posted to our website and can be found here: [https://www.birth23.org/wp-content/uploads/procedures/eval\\_assessment.docx](https://www.birth23.org/wp-content/uploads/procedures/eval_assessment.docx)

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**3 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3 - OSEP Response**

**3 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 4: Family Involvement

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Results indicator:** 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 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

#### Data Source

State selected data source. State must describe the data source in the SPP/APR.

#### 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.

#### Instructions

Sampling of families participating in Part C is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of families to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the infant or toddler, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the families responding are not representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to families (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person), if a survey was used, and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

## 4 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2006	Target>=	86.00%	86.00%	86.00%	86.00%	86.00%
A	79.00%	Data	89.04%	91.11%	89.17%	90.93%	91.22%
B	2006	Target>=	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
B	75.00%	Data	87.05%	88.61%	86.56%	88.67%	89.28%
C	2006	Target>=	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%
C	87.00%	Data	95.37%	96.51%	95.69%	96.13%	96.27%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target A>=	90.00%
Target B>=	91.00%
Target C>=	93.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

This Annual Performance Report (APR) of the State Performance Plan (SPP) was developed with broad stakeholder input. At a State Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) meeting in December 2020, the members reviewed results from FFY19 (7/1/19-6/30/20) for each indicator. As entered into

the online submission tool, a draft PDF of the APR was posted on the Birth to Three website, www.Birth23.org, in December 2020. The link was sent to the PTI, CPAC, Inc., and several national technical assistance (TA) centers, including DaSy, and the ECTA Center, whose staff reviewed the draft and provided helpful guidance. Access to EMAPS was given directly to several State ICC members who reviewed the file in detail, asked questions, and suggested edits. Leadership from the OEC also reviewed the APR and made suggestions. The ICC approved the final edits so that this Annual Performance Report (APR) fulfills the State Interagency Coordinating Council's obligations to report to the U.S. Department of Education in the current fiscal year (see attached certification).

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	1,462
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	383
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	348
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	383
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	343
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	383
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	370
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	383

Measure	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2)	91.22%	90.00%	90.86%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2)	89.28%	91.00%	89.56%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2)	96.27%	93.00%	96.61%	Met Target	No Slippage

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Question	Yes / No
Was a collection tool used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised collection tool?	NO
The demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.	YES

**Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.**

Connecticut interprets "enrolled in the Part C program" as those families who had an IFSP on 2/1/20, having been in Early Intervention for at least six months. All of those families are sent surveys (census). The demographics of the response pool (those that completed the survey) were compared to the census using a representativeness calculator created by the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center ([http://ectacenter.org/eco/assets/xls/Representativeness\\_calculator.xlsx](http://ectacenter.org/eco/assets/xls/Representativeness_calculator.xlsx)). The state compared race, ethnicity, language, insurance type, and length of time in EI in the calculator. The response pool was determined to represent all 16 variables, and 12 of the variables had response rates over 60%. This indicator is aligned with Indicator 11 of this report (the State Systemic Improvement Plan or SSIP). The survey data is used for various activities, and the validity, reliability, and representativeness of it is of critical importance to stakeholders.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**4 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4 - OSEP Response**

**4 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)) and Census (for the denominator).

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

## 5 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	0.93%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	1.20%	1.20%	1.21%	1.21%	1.21%
Data	1.15%	1.34%	1.29%	1.36%	1.19%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	1.21%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

This Annual Performance Report (APR) of the State Performance Plan (SPP) was developed with broad stakeholder input. At a State Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) meeting in December 2020, the members reviewed results from FFY19 (7/1/19-6/30/20) for each indicator. As entered into the online submission tool, a draft PDF of the APR was posted on the Birth to Three website, [www.Birth23.org](http://www.Birth23.org), in December 2020. The link was sent to the PTI, CPAC, Inc., and several national technical assistance (TA) centers, including DaSy, and the ECTA Center, whose staff reviewed the draft and provided helpful guidance. Access to EMAPS was given directly to several State ICC members who reviewed the file in detail, asked questions, and suggested edits. Leadership from the OEC also reviewed the APR and made suggestions. The ICC approved the final edits so that this Annual Performance Report (APR) fulfills the State Interagency Coordinating Council's obligations to report to the U.S. Department of Education in the current fiscal year (see attached certification).

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/08/2020	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	511
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/25/2020	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	34,625

### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
511	34,625	1.19%	1.21%	1.48%	Met Target	No Slippage

### Compare your results to the national data

Connecticut has narrow eligibility criteria and family continuing participation. Connecticut is above the national average of 1.37 percent. While comparing to other states with narrow eligibility, Connecticut is above the average of 1.11 percent.

### Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State of Connecticut uses a point in time date of 12/1/19 to collect the number of infants and toddlers birth to one with IFSPs. The date of 7/10/19 is the date that the collection closed for the 618 reporting period.

**5 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**5 - OSEP Response**

**5 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

Data collected under IDEA section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)) and Census (for the denominator).

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

## 6 - Indicator Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	3.16%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	3.75%	3.75%	3.87%	3.87%	3.87%
Data	4.18%	4.27%	4.36%	4.56%	4.94%

#### Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	4.00%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

This Annual Performance Report (APR) of the State Performance Plan (SPP) was developed with broad stakeholder input. At a State Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) meeting in December 2020, the members reviewed results from FFY19 (7/1/19-6/30/20) for each indicator. As entered into the online submission tool, a draft PDF of the APR was posted on the Birth to Three website, [www.Birth23.org](http://www.Birth23.org), in December 2020. The link was sent to the PTI, CPAC, Inc., and several national technical assistance (TA) centers, including DaSy, and the ECTA Center, whose staff reviewed the draft and provided helpful guidance. Access to EMAPS was given directly to several State ICC members who reviewed the file in detail, asked questions, and suggested edits. Leadership from the OEC also reviewed the APR and made suggestions. The ICC approved the final edits so that this Annual Performance Report (APR) fulfills the State Interagency Coordinating Council's obligations to report to the U.S. Department of Education in the current fiscal year (see attached certification).

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/08/2020	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	5,746
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/25/2020	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	106,513

#### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
5,746	106,513	4.94%	4.00%	5.39%	Met Target	No Slippage

#### Compare your results to the national data

Despite a narrow eligibility, Connecticut is proud to remain above the national average of 3.70 percent.

#### Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State of Connecticut uses a point in time date of 12/1/19 to collect the number of infants and toddlers birth to three with IFSPs. The date of 7/10/20 is the date that the collection closed for the 618 reporting period.

**6 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**6 - OSEP Response**

**6 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial 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)

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must address the timeline from point of referral to initial IFSP meeting based on actual, not an average, number of days.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers 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.

#### Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 7 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	95.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.92%	99.96%	99.98%	99.98%	100.00%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
4,678	6,227	100.00%	100%	99.92%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

### Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

1,544

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database

**Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).**

The full reporting period of July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.

**Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.**

Data are from the Connecticut Birth to Three data system for the entire reporting year and verified using a variety of general supervision components, including emails, ad hoc, standard data reports, on-site monitoring, self-assessments, and verification visits, and complaint data.

As this FFY19 APR is the subsequent year to FFY18, in FFY18 the state did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**7 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**7 - OSEP Response**

**7 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator:** The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

#### Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8A - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	99.90%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2019
Target	100%

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday. (yes/no)

YES

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
3,512	3,512	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

The full reporting period of July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Data are from the Connecticut Birth to Three data system for the entire reporting year and were verified using a variety of general supervision components, including emails, ad hoc and standard data reports, on-site monitoring, self-assessments, data verification visits, and complaint data.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

While the families of 5673 children exited Part C between July 1, 2019, and June 30, 2020, only 3771 exited after the 90-day deadline for this indicator. Of those, 259 had their initial IFSP meeting within 90 days of age three. This leaves 3512 children for whom there should have been an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days before the toddler's third birthday.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**8A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**8A - OSEP Response**

**8A - Required Actions**

## Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator:** The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

#### Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8B - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2019
Target	100%

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

YES

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
3,918	3,918	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Number of parents who opted out**

This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.

0

**Describe the method used to collect these data**

Since notification data is transmitted electronically from the Part C data system to the Part B (SEA and LEA) data system every night for all children with IFSPs who are over the age of 30 months, the denominator for this indicator was collected from the Part C statewide transactional database and is greater than the Indicator 8A and 8C data.

**Do you have a written opt-out policy? (yes/no)**

NO

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database

**Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).**

The full reporting period of July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.

**Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.**

Data are from the Connecticut Birth to Three data system for the entire reporting year and were verified using a variety of general supervision components, including emails, ad hoc and standard data reports, on-site monitoring, self-assessments, data verification visits, and complaints.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Over the course of the '19-'20 year, 5673 children exited Birth to Three. 259 of those children were determined to be eligible for Part C within 90 days of age 3, so the timeline for this indicator had already passed. The families of an additional 1496 children exited Birth to Three before the child reached age 30 months, so notification data was not sent about them, and they were not considered to be potentially eligible for Part B early childhood special education. The remaining 3918 children that exited in the '19-'20 year after turning age 30 months were considered to be potentially eligible because they had reached age 30 months and were still eligible for Part C. Notification data was transmitted to the SEA and LEAs nightly for all 3918 children. Potentially eligible for Part B at 30 months does not mean that the family stayed in Birth to Three until the child was 33 months old nor that the family approved including their LEA in transition planning. For these reasons, the number for this indicator is higher than the number used for transition plans (8a) and transition conferences (8c).

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**8B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**8B - OSEP Response**

## 8B - Required Actions

## Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator:** The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

#### Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8C - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	98.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.62%	99.93%	99.55%	99.58%	NVR

**Targets**

FFY	2019
Target	100%

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services (yes/no)

YES

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
2,673	3,242	NVR	100%	99.66%	Did Not Meet Target	N/A

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference

This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

558

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database

**Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).**

The full reporting period of July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.

**Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.**

Data are from the Connecticut Birth to Three data system for the entire reporting year and verified using a variety of general supervision components, including emails, ad hoc, standard data reports, on-site monitoring, self-assessments, and data verification visits, and complaints.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Even though this is not required until the subsequent year (FFY20), in '19-'20, 6 EIS programs had a total of 11 late transition conferences. Findings were not issues to those programs as all five were not awarded new contracts as a result of the 2019-2020 Request for Proposals (RFP).

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5	5	0	0

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

Findings of noncompliance for FFY17 were reported in FFY17 and not during FFY18. During FFY17, four EIS programs had a total of four late transition conferences. Finding letters were issued to two of the programs. The other two programs closed during FFY17. For the families of the four children with late conferences, the lead agency determined that the conferences were held and that the individual instances of noncompliance could not be corrected because this is an indicator with a timeline. The reasons for the delay included waiting for the LEA to attend or the LEA was unable to attend the transition conference.

In FFY18, two EIS programs had a total of 5 late transition conferences. A finding letter was issued to one of the programs. The other program had late conferences in the 1st quarter of the year and demonstrated 100% compliance for six months before the annual data was analyzed, and findings were issued. For the families of the 5 children with late conferences, the lead agency determined that the conferences were held and that the individual instances of noncompliance could not be corrected because this is an indicator with a timeline. The reasons for the delay included waiting for the LEA to attend or that the LEA was unable to attend the transition conference.

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

(FFY17) This is an indicator with a timeline. In each case where the transition data was late or missing, the state verified, using the statewide database, emails and phone calls with local programs, that the conference was ultimately held if the child did not exit before it could be held.

(FFY18) This is an indicator with a timeline. In each case where the transition data was late or missing, the state verified, using the statewide database, emails and phone calls with local programs, that the conference was ultimately held if the child did not exit before it could be held.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

<b>Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>

**8C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2018. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2019 in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR.

The State did not report that it identified any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must provide an explanation of why it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

**8C - OSEP Response**

**8C - Required Actions**

## Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

**Results indicator:** 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)

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

This indicator is not applicable to a State that has adopted Part C due process procedures under section 639 of the IDEA.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

### 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

YES

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.**

### 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

### 9 - OSEP Response

### 9 - Required Actions

## Indicator 10: Mediation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent =  $((2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) \text{ divided by } 2.1) \text{ times } 100$ .

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

### 10 - Indicator Data

#### Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

#### Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1 a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

This Annual Performance Report (APR) of the State Performance Plan (SPP) was developed with broad stakeholder input. At a State Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) meeting in December 2020, the members reviewed results from FFY19 (7/1/19-6/30/20) for each indicator. As entered into the online submission tool, a draft PDF of the APR was posted on the Birth to Three website, [www.Birth23.org](http://www.Birth23.org), in December 2020. The link was sent to the PTI, CPAC, Inc., and several national technical assistance (TA) centers, including DaSy, and the ECTA Center, whose staff reviewed the draft and provided helpful guidance. Access to EMAPS was given directly to several State ICC members who reviewed the file in detail, asked questions, and suggested edits. Leadership from the OEC also reviewed the APR and made suggestions. The ICC approved the final edits so that this Annual Performance Report (APR) fulfills the State Interagency Coordinating Council's obligations to report to the U.S. Department of Education in the current fiscal year (see attached certification).

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target>=					
Data	100.00%				

#### Targets

FFY	2019
Target>=	

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
		0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**10 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**10 - OSEP Response**

**10 - Required Actions**

## **Certification**

### **Instructions**

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

### **Certify**

I certify that I am the Director of the State's Lead Agency under Part C of the IDEA, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

### **Select the certifier's role**

Designated Lead Agency Director

**Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.**

**Name:**

Nicole Cossette

**Title:**

Part C Data Manager

**Email:**

nicole.cossette@ct.gov

**Phone:**

2038154953

**Submitted on:**