



COLORADO

State Performance Plan Federal IDEA, Part C Services

Submitted
February 1, 2011

Colorado Department of Human Services
Division for Developmental Disabilities
4055 South Lowell Blvd.
Denver, CO 80236
(303) 866-7263 Telephone
(303) 866-7680 Fax
www.eicolorado.org

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012
(February 1, 2011 Revision Based on the FFY 2005-2010 SPP,
February 2, 2009 and February 1, 2010 Revisions)

Overview of the Development of the State Performance Plan (SPP):

Background on the Initial SPP

The initial development of the SPP began during FFY 2004 by the former lead agency, the Colorado Department of Education (CDE). Colorado submitted the first SPP to the federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) in December 2005 and revised the plan on January 13, 2006 based on feedback from OSEP.

CDE developed the SPP in 2005 with broad stakeholder input from the Colorado Interagency Coordinating Council (CICC) and existing statewide interagency networks to establish the baseline data and develop targets, improvement activities, timelines, and resources for all 14 Indicators. CDE presented the requirement of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) 2004 to develop a six-year SPP for Part C to the CICC/Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) sub-committee who was charged with implementing Part C of IDEA in June 2005. The SPP was discussed with key stakeholders at the Colorado Summer Institute in August 2005. A review of the requirements for the SPP from OSEP was presented at the September 6, 2005 meeting of the CICC/MOU sub-committee, along with the initial plan for broad stakeholder input drafted by the lead agency. The plan for this input proposed utilizing the existing statewide and regional specific opportunities with various groups that had supported the work of the system of early intervention (EI) supports and services in Colorado over the years of full implementation of Part C of the IDEA of 2004. The SPP was posted on the state website and distributed through the CICC, the CICC/MOU sub-committee, local EI systems to agency partners, families and system stakeholders. A public notice of publication was posted in statewide news sources. The data from each local interagency coordinating council (LICC) was analyzed using state targets for all appropriate indicators and that report was published on the CDE website.

The CICC was presented with the framework of the SPP and had input through advisement as a Council at two meetings (September and November 2005) and as members of specific monitoring priority work groups (October 2005). In addition, specific groups with expertise in the monitoring priority areas were consulted on the development of the SPP according to their area of expertise (e.g., higher education faculty, families, direct service providers). This work was conducted around the state in various meeting and electronic formats from September – November 2005. Any indicator-specific strategies used and stakeholders included are noted in each of the following monitoring priority/indicator areas.

Lead Agency Change and Revisions to the SPP

On December 30, 2005, Governor Bill Owens issued an Executive Order (D 017 05) designating the Department of Human Services, Division for Developmental Disabilities (DDD) as the lead agency in Colorado for Part C of IDEA. After the change in lead agency, revisions were made to the SPP on the following dates:

- September 5, 2006 (Approved by OSEP)
- April 5, 2007 (Approved by OSEP)
- June 6, 2008 (Approved by OSEP)
- February 2, 2009
- April 6, 2009 (Approved by OSEP)
- February 1, 2010
- April 5, 2010 (Approved by OSEP)
- February 1, 2011 (pending approval by OSEP)

Colorado State

The following document is a complete revised SPP using the current OSEP template that addresses all 14 Indicators. DDD has revised the SPP for submission to OSEP on February 1, 2011 in order to ensure that it reflects the current system of early intervention services in Colorado and that it captures all of the activities used to meet federal Part C requirements. Modifications have been made to reorganize the document to include additional targets and improvement activities to extend through FFY 2012. These changes have been developed with input from key stakeholders and the CICC during the Fall 2010 annual planning meeting and the November 2010 quarterly meeting. The February 1, 2011 submission also reflects changes made based on information from the following resources:

- Feedback from OSEP through Colorado's previous Annual Performance Reports (APR);
- December 2007 OSEP Verification Visit;
- October 17, 2008 OSEP letter, *Reporting on Correction of Noncompliance in the Annual Performance Report Required Under Sections 616 and 642 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*;
- September 2, 2010 OSEP memorandum, *Frequently Asked Questions Regarding Identification and Correction of Noncompliance and Reporting on Correction in the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)*; and
- Assistance from use of materials from additional national technical assistance centers, such as the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC), Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center (MPRRC), and the Data Accountability Center (DAC) and other national consultants.

Baseline information described in the original and revised versions of the SPP has been preserved in the revised SPP submitted on February 1, 2011 in order to maintain the historical development of the SPP. The following modifications have been made to reflect current implementation:

- Improvement activities that have been completed are noted and changes to timelines are shown in bold font;
- Addition of improvement activities and targets for FFY 2011 and 2012 are shown in bold font;
- Descriptions of the current system have been added where changes have been made;
- Minor changes in wording to improve readability; and
- The addition of revised Indicator 3 baseline data and targets.

The February 1, 2011 revised SPP and subsequent SPPs will be posted on the DDD Early Intervention Colorado (EI Colorado) website, www.eicolorado.org under the Documents section, State Performance Plan link. The SPP will also be distributed to all Community Centered Board (CCB) EI programs, state advocacy groups and other key stakeholders. DDD will work with the Department of Human Services, Public Information Officer to distribute the SPP and APR to the media, as appropriate.

Required public reporting of each CCB performance on the Indicators is published on the EI Colorado website, www.eicolorado.org in the Spring of each year. Printed versions of the public reports are made available as needed.

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: See initial description of the SPP development.

Survey of the timelines and the local capacity for the timely receipt of services for the SPP was conducted from September-November 2005 within the programs funded through CDE, DDD and the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE), and guidance developed with the advisement of the CICC.

Discussions were held with local EI (Part C) coordinators, local CCB EI directors, Child Find coordinators and public health team leaders at regularly scheduled events or through electronic communication from September-November 2005.

Direct service providers were surveyed on the timeline and strategies via the statewide provider listserv and focus groups.

Revisions made to the SPP and submitted to OSEP in 2007 and subsequent years through 2011 were based on data gathered from state interagency partners and stakeholder input from the CICC and CICC/MOU subcommittee.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 1: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

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

Measurement:

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Part C state database has collected Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) data since the late 1990s. Database analyses revealed that local programs identified only month/year for the initiation date and a complete baseline could not be established due to incomplete data. (See estimated baseline below that was set in the original SPP). Training and technical assistance were provided to systematize data collection.

In 2005 CDE and Colorado's early intervention (EI) system, through broad stakeholder input and child record review, defined "timely" receipt of services to begin as soon as possible, but no later than 28 calendar days from the date the parent(s) consents to IFSP services. Justification or explanation for a service beginning outside of that timeline was required to be documented in the individual child record.

Since the change in lead agency in July 2006, Colorado has a system of 20 private not-for-profit CCBs that are designated annually by DDD to implement EI services in local communities. One of the requirements of a CCB is to conduct public awareness activities. CCBs serve as the initial point for contact and intake procedures, and the local education agency (LEA) Child Find teams have the responsibility to conduct the multidisciplinary evaluation and assessment for infants and toddlers. The CCBs provide service coordination and contract with private EI providers, or employ agency-based staff, to deliver EI services. CCBs are required to document in the statewide data system the actual start date of any new service identified through the IFSP process. If the service is initiated more than 28 calendar days from the date that the parent(s) consents to the service, the service coordinator must document the reason for the delay in the child's record in the statewide data system. DDD has provided training and technical assistance to CCBs to document systems reasons versus exceptional family reasons for late delivery of services.

DDD requires through CCB contracts that each CCB have a local interagency coordinating council (LICC) that provides the interagency collaboration necessary to effectively implement EI services.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004:

Eighty-seven percent (87%) of services on IFSPs in the Part C database were estimated to have been initiated within the state definition of "timely" based upon analysis of 65% of current IFSPs at the time.

Based upon a telephone survey conducted by CDE in October 2005 of local EI programs and local direct service providers, approximately 90% of services began within two-three weeks of parent consent to services. For services that began beyond the 28-day timeline, local programs cited difficulty scheduling with private providers billing Medicaid and bilingual service providers as barriers.

Colorado State

An accurate baseline was scheduled to be established in July 2006 from all current IFSPs in the Part C database using the newly defined state definition of timely service initiation date. Due to the change in lead agency, this did not occur until June 2007. Based on data analysis of 100% of the number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs with new services on initial IFSPs, reviews or annuals between August 1, 2006 and February 1, 2007, the percentage of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received timely delivery of services was 81.60%.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Although the month/day/year data field for IFSP service initiation has been in the Part C database since late 1990s, this was not a required field until the July 2006 version of the database and in the subsequent web-based DDD Community Contract and Management System (CCMSWeb).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will receive early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will receive early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will receive early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will receive early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will receive early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will receive early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.
2011 (2011-2012)	100% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will receive early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.
2012 (2012-2013)	100% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will receive early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

1.1	2006	A committee will be established from the CICC and higher education personnel to develop a strategic plan for professional training and education opportunities/ DDD staff, CICC and higher education representatives.
1.2	2007	Written notification of noncompliance and Plan of Correction (POC) procedures will be revised to ensure that CCBs are informed of and timely correct areas of noncompliance/ DDD staff.
1.3	2008	DDD and the CICC will use data from the APR and review of policies from other states to analyze the feasibility of maintaining 28-days as the rigorous measure for "timely services" and revise the state measurement, if appropriate/ DDD, CCB EI Workgroup, and CICC.
1.4	2005-2008	A parent training curriculum will be developed, and materials about the IFSP process, with an emphasis on service delivery and new state regulations on insurance and CHP+ funding will be developed and distributed/ DDD staff, Training Cadre, PEAK Parent Center staff and contract staff.
1.5	2007-2009	DDD will implement revised procedures for focused monitoring that effectively identify root causes for barriers to providing timely services for those CCBs that are low performing on Indicator 1/ DDD staff and interagency partners.
1.6	2008-2009	Colorado will participate as a pilot state for the National Early Childhood Professional Development Enhancement Center in the use of EI professional development materials and methodology/ DDD staff and NECPDE staff.
1.7	2008-2009	DDD will collaborate with professional development faculty and programs to develop a strategic plan for professional training and education opportunities/ DDD staff, CICC, contract staff and SpecialQuest State Leadership Team.
1.8	2008-2009	Direct service provider recruitment activities will be developed to address personnel shortages, including the development and distribution of a printed and web-based brochure to encourage professional and paraprofessional interest in EI careers/ DDD staff, contract staff and local EI programs.
1.9	2007-2010	Training and technical assistance will be provided on the use of assistive technology for infants and toddlers with assistive technology service needs identified through their IFSP/ DDD staff and contract staff.
1.10	2008-2010	A statewide database of EI providers will be developed and maintained to identify where personnel shortage exists, what area(s) of expertise providers have, and what specialized trainings have been completed by providers/ DDD staff and contract staff.
1.11	2005- 2012	Statewide training and technical assistance will be provided on the transdisciplinary/primary service provider model/ DDD staff and contract staff.
1.12	2006- 2012	An ongoing assessment and analysis of personnel needs through the EI Colorado Provider database will be conducted to identify where personnel shortage exists, in what area of expertise and focus recruitment activities to address shortages/ DDD staff.
1.13	2006- 2012	Training for service coordinators and providers on IFSP development with emphasis on services (timely delivery, documentation, funding hierarchy) will be continued/ DDD staff and contract staff.
1.14	2006- 2012	Training and technical assistance will be provided to local data managers on revised fields and requirements in the state web-based data system/ DDD staff.
1.15	2007- 2012	Training and technical assistance will be provided to CCBs on the implementation of the Coordinated System of Payments (CRS 27-10.5-701)/ DDD staff.

Colorado State

1.16	2007-2012	DDD will monitor all 20 CCBs for compliance on Indicator 1, using a combination of data review, self-assessment and onsite data verification visits, issue written notifications of findings of noncompliance and require POCs when deemed necessary by DDD staff/ DDD staff.
1.17	2007-2012	A statewide curriculum and system for EI paraprofessional training will be developed and implemented, including training for supervisors/ DDD staff and contract staff.
1.18	2008-2012	Materials for families about the IFSP process, with an emphasis on service delivery and state regulations on family cost participation will be updated as needed and distributed/ DDD staff and contract staff.
1.19	2008-2012	DDD will conduct a statewide fiscal study that includes analysis of average service levels, provider rates and average cost per child/ DDD staff.
1.20	2008-2012	Training for direct service providers specific to supporting children with significant social emotional concerns will be provided/ DDD staff and contract staff.
1.21	2011-2012	DDD will update the training and technical assistance materials to support the revised state EI rules related to Indicator 1/ DDD staff.

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: See initial description of the SPP development.

The original input for Indicator 2 was received from discussions held with the previous 32 local Part C coordinators, local CCB EI directors and public health team leaders at regularly scheduled events from September through November 2005.

Direct service providers were surveyed on the targets via the statewide provider listserv and focus groups from October through November 2005.

DDD revised this section with input from the CICC, CICC/MOU sub-committee, and other key statewide interagency partners in 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2010. No changes were made in 2009.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments

Indicator 2: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

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

Measurement:

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Colorado began a major emphasis in 1998 on providing services to a child and family in their everyday routines, activities and places.

In 2001, a multifaceted initiative was implemented, including funding, technical assistance and training, addressing the barriers and creating solutions to delivering services in home and community-based settings. Subsequently, ten communities established transdisciplinary teams in 2002, and an additional eight teams during 2003-2005. In 2005, a statewide focus on best practices in service delivery was emphasized with continual adoption of these practices across communities. Resources and training were provided to support the implementation of these service delivery models.

Since July 2006, direct services have been delivered primarily through CCBs that contract with EI teams or individual service providers.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004:

Eighty-seven and one-half percent (87.5%) of services were primarily delivered in family homes and community-based settings.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The Part C database captured the data that showed an increase in services that were provided in the home or community settings from 76% in FFY 2002 to 87.5% by FFY 2004.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	88% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.
2006 (2006-2007)	90% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.
2007 (2007-2008)	90.5% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.
2008 (2008-2009)	91% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.
2009 (2009-2010)	93% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.
2010 (2010-2011)	95% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.
2011 (2011-2012)	95% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.
2012 (2012-2013)	95% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

2.1	2005	A parent training curriculum will be developed and piloted along with associated materials/ former lead agency (CDE) staff, Training Cadre, and contract staff.
2.2	2006	A committee from the CICC and higher education personnel will be established to develop a strategic plan for professional training/education opportunities/ DDD staff, CICC, higher education representatives.
2.3	2007	Written notification of noncompliance and POC procedures will be revised to ensure that CCBs are informed of and timely correct areas of noncompliance/ DDD staff.
2.4	2007	The state database will be modified to be web-based to allow for closer monitoring of focus areas, such as the delivery of services in natural environments/ DDD staff.
2.5	2005-2008	Training for direct service providers specific to supporting children with significant social emotional concerns will be provided and a statewide cadre of resource specialists (resource areas including working with families impacted by homelessness, child abuse and neglect and substance abuse or exposure) will be created/ DDD staff, Center for Social Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (CSEFEL), CAPTA training team and contract staff.
2.6	2006-2008	Parent training will be provided about IFSP process, with an emphasis on service delivery in every day routines, activities and places, and associated materials will be developed for statewide dissemination/ DDD staff, PEAK Parent Center, and contract staff.
2.7	2007-2009	DDD will implement revised procedures for focused monitoring that effectively identify root cause of barriers for those CCBs that are low performing on this indicator/ DDD staff.
2.8	2005-2010	Statewide training and technical assistance will be provided on the transdisciplinary/primary service provider model/ DDD staff and contract staff.
2.12	2007-2010	The committee to expand and maintain the comprehensive system of personnel development will be continued/ DDD staff, CICC, higher education, national consultants and other professional development resources.

2.9	2005-2012	Technical assistance will be developed and disseminated through multiple methods (tiered training, establishment of cadre of regional consultants specializing in Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD), and web-based resources) for direct service providers working with children on the autism spectrum/ DDD staff and contract staff.
2.10	2005-2012	The Service Coordination Core Competencies training, on-line training modules and required training on IFSP development with emphasis on service locations will continue/ DDD staff and contract staff.
2.11	2005-2012	Parents and service providers will be provided training at the statewide <i>Parents Encouraging Parents</i> conference on the IFSP process with an emphasis on services in natural environments (i.e., every day routines, activities and places)/ DDD staff and contract staff.
2.13	2008-2012	Materials will be developed and disseminated to families about the IFSP process, with an emphasis on service delivery in everyday routines, activities and places/ DDD staff and contract staff.
2.14	2008-2012	Parents and service providers will be provided training at the statewide <i>Conference on Inclusive Education</i> on the IFSP process with an emphasis on services in natural environments (i.e. everyday routines, activities, and places)/ DDD staff and contract staff.
2.15	2007-2012	DDD will monitor all 20 CCBs for compliance on related requirements for Indicator 2, using a combination of data review, self-assessment and onsite data verification visits, issue written notifications of noncompliance, and require POCs when noncompliance is identified/ DDD staff.

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: See initial description of the SPP development.

Broad stakeholder input was a part of the approach in developing the Colorado Birth to Five Child and Family Outcomes Measurement System, known as Results Matter. Since its inception in June 2004, Results Matter included ongoing communications and meetings with state level administrators in multiple offices from CDE, CDHS, CICC, the foundation community, higher education, Early Childhood State Systems Team (Parent Engagement Task Force), local administrators of EI services, child care, preschool, preschool special education, mental health, health and social services, direct service providers and families. Electronic communication with the above groups also provided statewide input.

The Results Matter Workgroup, which was composed of staff from DDD, CDE, Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center staff and contract staff through the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center/JKF Partners, contributed data and other reports that informed the development of revised activities through 2010. A new advisory group, the Child Outcomes Task Force, composed of parents and representatives from early intervention programs, higher education, and ECO Center staff, contributed to the development of the revised activities for FY 2011-2012.

Revisions were made to the SPP on March 30, 2007 to comply with requirements noted by OSEP in their response letter to the FFY 2005 APR.

Revisions were submitted February 1, 2010 and February 1, 2011 to comply with the requirements to report baseline data, set and revise targets and describe the current system.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments

Indicator 3: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

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

Measurement:

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in category (d) divided by [# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d)] times 100.

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

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Since 2002, the Colorado EI system has focused on authentic assessment practices, observation, and documentation methodologies. Beginning Fall 2003, CDE began tracking child outcomes progress via IFSP reviews through the monitoring process. In Summer 2004, Part C and Part B 619 and Colorado Preschool Program staff wrote a General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG) proposal with the ECO Center staff. The CICC was informed of the state application for an outcomes-focused GSEG at the annual Fall 2004 retreat. CDE was awarded the grant. The state decided to use the same child outcomes statements adopted by OSEP. The Results Matter program encompassed the early care and education system for children birth to five years of age.

In 2005, CDE identified stakeholders in the outcomes measurement system development process and engaged various stakeholders over the following 16 months through meetings and electronic communications at state and local levels in various formats and venues (e.g., local EI administrator meetings, Consolidated Child Care Pilot meetings, LICC meetings, meetings with local direct service providers, and electronic surveys of groups of direct service providers). A survey of local early childhood programs was conducted to determine which ongoing assessment tools were being used. The survey did not show a consensus in the use of a statewide common assessment tool. The CDE team developed the Results Matter values, beliefs and policies for assessing very young children. Along with the ECO Center, the team conducted or reviewed crosswalks of assessment tools of child outcomes to determine if they measured the child outcomes and compared the assessment tools with the Results Matter values, beliefs and policies.

The Results Matter program staff determined a finite list of four tools or assessment systems that were curriculum referenced with a stand-alone child outcome assessment format. Methodologies to score and report the data at a local level and report to the state level were devised with technical assistance from the ECO Center. All EI programs chose the assessment(s) they would be using by early 2006. CDE began training providers and programs (e.g., use of assessment instruments, scoring, data reporting, etc.) in Spring 2006 in regions across the state. Work on the data system continued within the Results Matter Workgroup along with the ECO Center staff. Data collection began in July 2006 with reporting through local aggregation of individual entry status data reported to the state through the publishers' online data systems.

Programs collecting and reporting data on individual child progress were phased in around the state during FFY 2006 and actual implementation was dependent upon when direct service providers received training. Initial statewide training was completed in late 2006. Programs in the first stage of training began collecting data on children entering EI services in Summer 2006. Technical assistance and follow-up support provided by DDD, CDE Part B/619 and Colorado Preschool Program staff, and contract staff began in 2006.

Colorado had four approved assessment tools:

- The Ounce
- High/Scope Child Observation Record (not used by EI services)
- Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum
- Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System for Infants and Toddlers (AEPS)

Colorado State

One of the tools listed above was used to assess each child within eight to ten weeks of entry into services, prior to each annual review of the IFSP, and upon exit from the system. Providers involved in delivering EI services to the child and family were responsible for completing the assessment at each checkpoint. Each IFSP team identified a primary provider to ensure the assessment was completed timely and accurately. Individual service providers, or local data entry personnel, enter data into the publisher's online system. State EI Colorado staff had access to the online data and ensured that data was being reported as required.

Colorado has not used sampling for Indicator 3. Each of the 20 CCBs responsible for EI services selected and implemented one of the approved tools for ongoing assessment and data collection and began entering data for all children entering the system July 1, 2006 or after and who have received services for at least six months. The AEPS was the most frequently used tool for ongoing assessment and data collection for EI services. Finalization of data entry was established at the following checkpoints for local programs:

- **Entry Data** - Within eight to ten weeks of services being initiated (unless a child is younger than six months of age, then the first data entry checkpoint is when the child turns six months of age);
- At the annual IFSP; and
- **Exit Data** - Within 90 days prior to the child's exit from EI services.

The following training and technical assistance were provided to administrators and service providers to support implementation of the system:

- All service providers were required to receive training in the administration of the ongoing assessment tool selected by the local program, including online data entry. Initially, state-led trainings were provided to all communities. For ongoing training on the tools, many communities established local trainers.
- Administrators received training and ongoing technical assistance for the online systems from the publishers of those systems.
- A technical assistance workgroup developed and implemented training curriculum to the state early childhood system. Topics included:
 - Assessment observation
 - Assessment documentation
 - Training-of-Trainers in the AEPS

Multiple methods were implemented to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the child outcomes data:

- The use of online data systems for each of the tools allowed for real time monitoring of data. Checks were made to ensure that children entering the system had entry data within eight to ten weeks of services being initiated, and children exiting the system had data entered and finalized within 90 days prior to leaving the EI program.
- Initial and ongoing training on each of the tools being utilized was provided to support the appropriate administration and use of the tools and online system for data entry and finalization.
- The Results Matter Workgroup collaborated with the ECO Center and the assessment publishers/developers to analyze assessment items, distribution of results, correlation to the federal outcomes and proper calibration of the assessments based on ongoing data analysis. Reports included:
 - Progress data by local program
 - Progress data by county
 - Progress data by demographics
 - Progress data by funding source and quality indicators
 - Comparison of Colorado data to other states
- Reports were used to identify weaknesses that may be leading to data collection errors so that strategies could be utilized to address those weaknesses, such as training, clarification documents, etc.
- The Results Matter Workgroup worked with the publishers of the online data systems to ensure that the determination of progress for each child was accurate. Reports were reviewed by the Results Matter Workgroup and discussed to determine if variations or unusual patterns exist across groups, etc. and to identify strategies for addressing the variations.
- Based on reports and ongoing discussions, the Results Matter Workgroup provided feedback to local programs and to EI providers to support increased quality of the data.

Colorado State

- Results Matter established a provider listserv for EI providers in Colorado. The listserv was used for the distribution of feedback on current data reports and for online discussions of the meaning of the data, strategies for improving the data, and identification of additional supports needed to ensure the quality of the data. In addition, Results Matter worked with the publishers of the online systems to establish provider lists associated with each tool so that alerts and other communication specific to the tool were sent to providers immediately.

Data system elements for outcome data input, maintenance and outcome data analysis include the following:

- Secure online systems created by the publishers of the tools used by the state are being used to record and analyze all assessment data. These online systems apply an automated conversion from individual assessment results to the ECO Child Outcomes Summary rating and the OSEP reporting categories.
- Data are entered at the local level by the EI provider(s) completing the assessment or by CCB staff entering data from hard copies of the EI providers' assessment results.
- DDD staff has the ability to review real-time data at the child, program, county and statewide levels.
- Strategies, including professional development activities, technical assistance and printed resources, are being put into place to assist local administrators and direct service providers in using the online systems to self-monitor and refine their timely, reliable and valid use of the assessment tools. At the state level, ongoing data analysis and implementation monitoring inform ongoing technical assistance to local systems, as well as collaborative efforts with the ECO Center and the assessment system publishers.

Measurement strategies used to collect data include:

- All children who entered the EI system on or after July 1, 2006 and who have remained in the system for at least six months before exiting are included in the measurement. Every subsequent year, DDD reports on entry and exit data for all infants and toddlers in the EI system.
- Each of the three tools utilized includes an online system for the collection and analysis of data. These online systems produce reports based on the measurement requirements established by OSEP. Each publisher of the online systems continues to refine the reporting capabilities of their systems.
- The ongoing assessments are conducted by the EI providers. If multiple providers are working with a child, the team works together to complete the assessment with one of the providers taking primary lead on the activity.
- Measurements occur within eight to ten weeks of services being initiated, at the annual IFSP, and within 90 days of the child exiting the system.
- Data analysis methods used to determine the progress categories use automated online systems. Colorado's assessment data has been converted to the seven points of the *Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF) Scale*. The assessment publishers have calibrated their tools to the *Summary Form Rating Scale* based on guidance provided by the ECO Center.

According to *Early Childhood Outcomes: OSEP TA Document for Five Reporting Categories* dated September 7, 2006, "If a State is using the ECO summary tool, then the criteria for defining 'comparable to same age peers' has been defined as a child who has been scored as a six or seven on the COSF." Colorado's assessment data has been converted to the seven points of the *Child Outcomes Summary Form Scale* and the scale defines a six or seven as functioning comparable to same age peers. That guidance identified children above the 10th percentile as functioning comparable to same age peers (i.e., a six or seven on the scale).

Discussion of Current System or Process for FFY 2010:

Effective July 1, 2010, the contractual arrangement with CDE to manage the collection of child outcomes data through Results Matter was discontinued. DDD assumed full responsibility for managing child outcomes data collection and the training and technical assistance for local programs and providers.

A Child Outcomes Task Force was convened in June 2010 with representation from CCBs, providers, family members, EI Colorado staff, service coordinators, higher education and the Colorado Lieutenant Governor's office. After discussion with the Child Outcomes Task Force and the CICC, the decision was made to discontinue the use of the online publisher's data analysis systems through Brooke's Publishing, Pearson and Teaching Strategies. Colorado is phasing out the use of the online data systems by July 1, 2011 and is implementing the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF) process to collect data for Child Outcomes.

Colorado State

Additional activities by the Child Outcomes Task Force and EI Colorado staff include:

- Develop a state version of the COSF;
- Review child assessment instruments for use in child outcomes measurement;
- Communicate changes in data collection practices to stakeholders including the CICC and early intervention partners;
- Revise policies and procedures to reflect the new requirements;
- Develop training in collaboration with the ECO Center;
- Provide four statewide training events and four technical assistance calls;
- Work with programs to identify providers to serve as local trainers for the COSF process;
- Facilitate appropriate changes to the EI Colorado Provider Database to collect child outcomes data;
- Create informational materials for families; and,
- Collaborate with CDE to create an interagency data sharing agreement for child outcomes.

In addition, ongoing technical assistance regarding the use of the COSF will be provided by EI Colorado staff. Movement from the online publisher's data analysis systems began in early Winter of 2010 with full implementation of the COSF process to occur by July 1, 2011.

The shift to the COSF system for collecting child outcomes data will:

- Utilize multiple methods for authentic assessment to determine the measurements (e.g., family information, assessment tool measurements and observation);
- Provide local communities greater flexibility in the choice of assessment tools used as part of the child outcomes data collection process;
- Facilitate continuity for infants and toddlers and their families by incorporating information gathered during intake and transition activities into the child outcomes measurements process and fully utilizing the expertise of Child Find teams;
- Eliminate the application of an additional online assessment of the child and family by using information from assessments already completed;
- Provide, through review of individual child records, a mechanism for monitoring of data collection and inter-rater reliability; and,
- Create a greater understanding of the three Child Outcomes and facilitate development of functional outcomes during the IFSP process.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Baseline data reported for FFY 2008 was for those children who exited the program between July 1, 2008 and June 30, 2009, who received services for at least six months, for whom both entry and exit assessments had been completed.

Colorado collaborated with the ECO Center and other states using the online tools to analyze the publishers' tools. Thus far it has been concluded that the high scores for children functioning within age expectations were due to cutoffs for determining age level calculations for the online calculations being set too low.

A preliminary quality analysis on the data from the AEPS, the tool used to collect 90% of child outcomes data for EI services in Colorado, showed that the quality of the data was supported by the analyses conducted for the report. The correlations between chronological age and raw scores were high for all assessments completed. The correlations between the outcome areas were also high. The assessment was sensitive to change in almost all children. This analysis established the quality and validity of child outcome data being collected in Colorado.

During the first two years of collecting and analyzing data, Colorado, as well as other states using online publisher's tools, identified some challenges in the publishers' conversion of assessment scores to the OSEP reporting categories. This was consistent across all four tools being used in Colorado for children, ages birth to five. As a result, data from the first two years reflected a higher than expected rate of children who presented as maintaining functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers, as well as a lower than expected rate of children who substantially increased their rate of growth. Colorado continued to work closely with the publishers and developers of the tools on resolving this issue.

Colorado collaborated with the ECO Center and other states using the online publisher's tools to determine the contributing factors to the issue and successfully corrected the cut points for the FFY 2008-2009 reporting year and is requesting to change the baseline data for Indicator 3 which will in turn change the targets set for FFY 2009 through 2012. Changes in baseline and targets for this Indicator are shown in strike-through for data that will be deleted and bold, red font for revised data that will replace the original information.

Baseline Progress Categories Data for FFY 2008-2009 (Recalculated):

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning.	44 29	3.8% 3.2%
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	125 119	10.8% 13.2%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach.	10 78	0.90% 8.7%
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	33 224	2.9% 24.9%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	944 449	81.6% 50.0%
Total	N=1153 N=899	100%

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning.	46 27	4.0% 3.0%
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	120 206	10.4% 22.9%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach.	9 66	.80% 7.3%
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	47 305	4.1% 34.0%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	934 295	80.7% 32.8%
Total	N=1153 N=899	100%

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning.	28 25	2.4% 2.8%
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	94 129	7.9% 14.3%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach.	24 49	1.8% 5.5%
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	76 222	6.6% 24.7%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	937 474	81.3% 52.7%
Total	N=1153 N=899	100%

Baseline Summary Statement Data for Infants and Toddlers Exiting in 2008-2009:

Summary Statements	% of Children
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectation 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.	20.30% 67.10%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.	84.50% 74.90%
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectation 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.	25.20% 61.40%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.	84.80% 66.70%
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectation 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.	44.90% 63.80%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.	87.90% 77.40%

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2005-2008	Not Applicable

Targets for Infants and Toddlers Exiting in FFY 2008 (2008-2009) through FFY 2012 (2012-13) and Reported February 2010 through February 2014:

Summary Statements	Targets for FFY 2009	Targets for FFY 2010	Targets for FFY 2011	Targets for FFY 2012
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)				
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectation 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.	20.50% 68.00%	20.75% 68.00%	68.00%	68.00%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.	84.75% 75.00%	85.00% 75.00%	75.00%	75.00%
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)				
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectation 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.	25.50% 62.00%	25.75% 62.00%	62.00%	62.00%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.	85.00% 67.00%	85.25% 67.00%	67.00%	67.00%
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs				
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectation 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.	45.00% 64.00%	45.25% 64.00%	64.00%	64.00%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.	88.00% 78.00%	88.25% 78.00%	78.00%	78.00%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

3.1	2006-2007	Training and technical assistance will be offered to all CCBs regarding the full implementation of Results Matter/ DDD staff and contract staff.
3.2	2006-2007	Recommendations will be developed on how best to report progress data for the FFY 2006 APR (submitted February 1, 2008)/ DDD staff, Results Matter staff, contract staff, and ECO Center staff.
3.3	2006-2008	Information on the child outcome initiative will be disseminated statewide through communication in various formats to engage and communicate with multiple stakeholders about the child outcome initiative, Results Matter/ DDD staff, Results Matter staff, contract staff and ECO Center staff.
3.4	2006-2009	A system will be developed to enhance statewide capacity to provide ongoing training on the four assessment tools, including a train-the-trainer initiative for the AEPS (the primary tool used by EI programs in Colorado)/ DDD staff, Results Matter staff, contract staff, and ECO Center staff.
3.5	2006-2009	Statewide training, mentoring and technical assistance will be provided for direct service providers and local EI staff on the four assessment systems / DDD staff, Results Matter staff, and contract staff.
3.6	2006-2009	Training and technical assistance on the online data systems and reports used to collect and analyze ongoing child outcomes data across the four assessment systems will be developed and implemented/ DDD staff, Results Matter staff, contract staff and ECO Center staff.
3.7	2007-2010	Work will continue with the ECO Center to review and analyze data in order to ensure the validity and reliability of the data and improve the overall outcomes measurement system/ DDD staff and ECO Center staff.
3.8	2007-2010	Work will continue with the publishers of the online data collection systems for each tool in order to ensure data reporting is appropriate to the outcomes being measured and in alignment with federal requirements/ DDD staff.
3.9	2010-2011	The EI Colorado Provider Database will be modified to collect child outcomes data and create reports/ DDD staff and contract staff.
3.10	2010-2011	DDD will work collaboratively with the Colorado Department of Education to develop an interagency agreement on data sharing to monitor the compliance for Indicator 3/ DDD staff and CDE staff.
3.11	2006-2012	Data will be collected and analyzed for use at the federal, state and local levels to inform families, child-level planning, local program-level training, technical assistance and impact of services, and state-level training and technical assistance and results of services/ DDD staff.
3.12	2010-2012	Training and technical assistance on the use of the Child Outcomes Summary Form to collect child outcomes data will be provided to CCBs and providers including service coordinators/ DDD staff, ECO Center staff and locally identified trainers.
3.13	2010-2012	Materials will be developed to inform families, service coordinators and service providers about the EI Colorado child and family outcomes measurement system/ DDD staff.
3.14	2010-2012	Materials will be developed and disseminated statewide to describe EI Colorado child and family outcomes publicly reported data/ DDD staff, Child Outcomes Task Force and CICC.

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: See initial description of the SPP development.

Broad stakeholder input was a part of the approach in developing the Colorado Birth to Five Child and Family Outcomes Measurement System, known as Results Matter. Since its inception in June 2004, Results Matter included ongoing communications and meetings with state level administrators in multiple offices from CDE, DDD, CICC, higher education, Early Childhood State Systems Team (Parent Engagement Task Force), local administrators of EI services, child care, preschool, preschool special education, mental health, health and social services, direct service providers and families. Electronic communication with the above groups provided statewide input.

The Results Matter Workgroup, which was composed of staff from DDD, CDE, ECO Center staff and contract staff through the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center/JKF Partners, contributed data and other reports that informed the development of revised activities.

Revisions were made on March 30, 2007 to comply with requirements noted by OSEP in their response letter to the FFY 2005 APR. These included correcting wording of the targets to be in full alignment with the OSEP measurement criteria and describing a process for setting the baseline for target 4B that encompassed a statewide distribution of the measurement. Members of the CICC and other key stakeholders contributed to the development of the revised activities for FY 2011-2012.

Revisions were also made in the February 1, 2011 submission to extend targets and describe the current system.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

Measurement:

- A. Percent = # of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights divided by the # of respondent families participating in Part C times 100.
- B. Percent = # of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs divided by the # of respondent families participating in Part C times 100.
- C. Percent = # of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn divided by the # of respondent families participating in Part C times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

In FFY 2004, CDE utilized a survey of families based upon the National Early Intervention Longitudinal Study (NEILS) survey in its monitoring process that collected the required information for Indicator 4A and 4C in eight monitored communities, including five of the largest populated counties, urban and rural settings. CDE proposed to continue using that instrument on a statewide basis for at least one more year with the addition of a question to address 4B. Due to the change in lead agency, CDE did not disseminate the statewide survey.

Along with the ECO Center, CDE proposed to pilot the ECO family assessment tool in FFY 2006. In Fall 2007, DDD staff worked with key stakeholders in the family outcomes measurement system development process, the CICC, CICC/MOU sub-committee and the Parent Leadership Task Force to further explore the specific tool for future use to measure progress on Indicator 4 with the intent of creating an inclusive approach to measuring family outcomes.

DDD adopted the ECO Family Outcomes Survey. In the first year of distribution (June 2007), the general birth to age five survey form was used. In April 2008, DDD used the birth to three version of the survey as opposed to the general survey.

Colorado State

DDD along with the Results Matter Workgroup devised methodologies to report the data from the family assessment tool at both the local and statewide level.

The 20 CCBs responsible for implementing EI services throughout the state have a key role in the reliability of the data being collected. CCBs have the ability to more effectively provide training to their service coordinators and providers and to inform parents receiving services through the EI system at the local level of the family outcomes activities.

Effective July 1, 2010, the contractual arrangement with CDE to manage the collection of family outcomes data through Results Matter was discontinued. DDD assumed full responsibility for managing family outcomes data collection and the training and technical assistance for local programs and providers. DDD utilizes the *Early Intervention Outcomes Survey* tool and has devised methodologies to report the data from the family assessment tool at both the state and local level.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004-2005:

Data from the initial CDE Family Survey Tool:

- A) Sixty-five percent (65%) of families surveyed report that EI services have helped their family “a lot” in understanding their rights and 28% report that EI services have helped “some.”
- B) (see below Baseline Data for FFY 2006-2007)
- C) Sixty-five percent (65%) of families “strongly agree” that EI services have helped their child develop and learn and 32% “agree” that EI services helped.

Baseline Data for FFY 2006-2007:

- B) Baseline was to be established in December 2006 using the statewide survey. For FFY 2006-2007, ninety-four percent (94%) of families surveyed report that EI services have helped the family effectively communicate their children’s needs.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The FFY 2004 survey of families in the monitored communities included five of the largest counties in Colorado and four of the five largest EI programs. This survey also included mid-sized and rural communities (two small and two mid-sized). The survey results, with a 19% return rate equally distributed across communities, were considered representative of the communities in the state. Data from the FFY 2004 survey were used to set the baseline data for Indicator 4A and 4C. Information on the content of Indicator 4B was not collected at that time. The original plan by CDE was to distribute a statewide survey in December 2006 to collect the data needed to establish a baseline for Indicator 4B. Due to the change in lead agency this did not occur. After discussing the matter with OSEP in March 2007, the SPP was modified to document a different process and timelines were established for collecting baseline data for Indicator 4B. A statewide distribution of the ECO Family Survey to all families with an IFSP who were actively receiving services occurred in Spring 2007.

In the FFY 2005 APR, DDD reported that once the baseline was set for Indicator 4B, subsequent targets would be set. The FFY 2007-2010 targets in the SPP submitted on February 1, 2008 were revised to reflect an increase in increments of 1.25 percent over the FFY 2006 baseline. After analysis of a single year of data, a baseline of 94% was established and reported in the APR submitted February 1, 2008.

In Fall 2008, DDD and the Results Matter Workgroup reviewed data collected after the second year of implementation of the Family Outcomes Survey. Based on the more comprehensive data gathered in Spring 2008 and stakeholder input, future targets on Indicator 4B were revised to be 87.25% for FFY 2008, 87.5% for FFY 2009 and 88% for FFY 2010. These adjustments better aligned the 4B targets with family outcome targets for 4A and 4C.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) 70% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights. B) Baseline not yet established for percentage of families who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs. C) 70% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn.
2006 (2006-2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) 73% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights. B) 94% established by September 30, 2007 for percentage of families who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs. C) 73% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn.
2007 (2007-2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) 75% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights. B) 95.25% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs. C) 75% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services helped the family help their children develop and learn.
2008 (2008-2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) 80% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights. B) 87.25% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs. C) 80% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services helped the family help their children develop and learn.
2009 (2009-2010)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) 83% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights. B) 87.50% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs. C) 83% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn.
2010 (2010-2011)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) 85% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights. B) 88% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs. C) 85% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn.

<p>2011 (2011-2012)</p>	<p>A) 85% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights.</p> <p>B) 88% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs.</p> <p>C) 85% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn.</p>
<p>2012 (2012-2013)</p>	<p>A) 85% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights.</p> <p>B) 95% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs.</p> <p>C) 85% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn.</p>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

4.1	2005	A parent training curriculum will be developed and piloted along with associated materials about the IFSP process, family rights and communication strategies/ former lead agency (CDE) Part C staff, Training Cadre, PEAK Parent Center staff, and contract staff.
4.2	2007	Targets for 4A, 4B and 4C will be revised based on two years data from surveys/ DDD staff and Results Matter team.
4.3	2005-2006	Continue work with the Early Childhood State Systems Team Parent Leadership Task Force to develop most effective and efficient methodologies for contacting and communicating with families to assure information is provided and families know their local and state level resources for support, and information will be disseminated and technical assistance provided to CCBs/ former lead agency (CDE) Part C staff and Parent Leadership Task Force.
4.4	2005-2007	The Inspiring Futures publication will be revised and disseminated/ DDD staff.
4.5	2005-2008	The <i>ABCs of Parent Leadership</i> training will be provided annually/ DDD staff, and PEAK Parent Center staff.
4.6	2006-2008	Parent training will be provided on a regional basis and materials disseminated statewide/ DDD staff, contract staff, and contract staff.
4.7	2007-2008	Revisions will be made to the documents distributed to families, as well as the distribution process in order to improve responses, representativeness and usefulness of the information/ DDD staff, CICC workgroup and Results Matter team.
4.8	2007-2009	DDD will work with the Legal Center for People with Disabilities and Older People to provide regional training to EI staff and families regarding procedural safeguards/ DDD staff and Legal Center staff.
4.9	2008-2009	Strategies and procedures used in other states to implement The Family Outcomes Survey will be reviewed to determine if they may be applicable in Colorado to improve return rates, demographic representation and overall outcomes/ DDD staff and Results Matter team.

Colorado State

4.10	2005-2012	Statewide training on IFSP process, family rights, communication strategies will be provided for parents and service providers two times per year at the <i>Parents Encouraging Parents</i> (PEP) conference/ DDD staff.
4.11	2005-2012	A statewide survey will be conducted of families currently receiving EI services and/or within one year of exiting EI services using family survey tool/ DDD staff.
4.12	2005-2012	Required Service Coordination Core Competencies Training will continue to provide training on understanding and communicating parental rights, communication strategies for families/ DDD staff.
4.13	2007-2012	Data from family surveys will be collected and analyzed by each local program in order to provide an additional source of data for local status determinations/ DDD staff.
4.14	2007-2012	Written directions will be provided to local programs on preparing families for the survey and encouraging families to complete the survey within one month of the distribution/ DDD staff.
4.15	2007-2012	Assistance will be provided to Spanish-speaking support groups to distribute and support completion of the survey among Spanish-speaking families/ DDD staff and contract staff.
4.16	2008-2012	Technical assistance will be accessed in the area of statistical data analysis of the family outcomes data in order to identify possible issues contributing to the lack of progress/ DDD staff.
4.17	2008-2012	Materials for families on rights and procedural safeguards will be revised and disseminated statewide and training on the use of the materials will be provided to service coordinators/ DDD staff.
4.18	2010-2012	Materials will be developed to inform families, service coordinators and service providers about the EI Colorado child and family outcomes measurement system/ DDD staff.
4.19	2010-2012	Materials will be developed and disseminated statewide to describe EI Colorado child and family outcomes publicly reported data/ DDD staff, Child Outcomes Task Force and CICC.

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: See initial description of the SPP development.

In 2005, CDE disseminated a survey to all local Part C coordinators, EI directors of the CCBs, Child Find coordinators in administrative units, public health team leaders and the state's higher education listserv. This survey queried local communities about their most recent identification data in order to compare data from previous years and identify the community's knowledge of local characteristics to determine if the community was identifying all eligible children. Targets were established with input from these specific groups, as well as through advisement from the CICC.

Since FFY 2006, DDD has developed revised improvement activities for Indicator 5 with input from the CICC, CICC/MOU sub-committee, the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit (NICU) Liaison Project, Assuring Better Health and Child Development (ABCD) project, contract providers and physician consultants.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 5: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

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

Measurement:

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

As the lead agency for Part C of IDEA, DDD has the responsibility of assuring that Colorado has a statewide, comprehensive, coordinated, multidisciplinary, interagency child identification system. Currently, the model that is utilized at the local level is a collaboration of the local education agencies (LEAs) and CCBs in a shared responsibility for meeting child identification requirements, including procedures for determining eligibility, complying with timelines and meeting qualified personnel standards. In most areas of the state, the LEAs conduct multidisciplinary evaluation and assessment while CCBs are responsible for referral and intake processes, service coordination and the development of the IFSP. LICCs, which have membership from LEAs and CCBs, as well as other key stakeholders, have responsibility for ensuring an effective local child identification process.

The LEA, CCB and the other LICC members work collaboratively to develop child identification procedures, strategies for using a coordinated information management system and an evaluation model designed to assess the effectiveness of the process. Interagency processes must be in place to ensure the referral for eligibility determination of any child, birth through two years of age, who is involved in a substantiated case of child abuse or neglect or is identified as affected by illegal substance abuse or withdrawal symptoms resulting from prenatal drug exposure.

Although Child Find has been provided in Colorado for many years under the rubric of federal statute, in Spring 2007 new legislation (Senate Bill 07-255) was enacted that put into state statute the defined roles of DDD, CDE, CCBs and local administrative units (AUs) for the screening and evaluation of infants and toddlers who have been referred to the EI system.

The eligible population information has been tracked in the statewide EI database since the early 1990s.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004:

The identification rate for infants entering the system was first analyzed in June 2003 indicating 0.54% of all children in the system were between birth and one year of age upon entry. On December 1, 2005, 0.74% of children birth to one year old in the general population had IFSPs in the Colorado public system of EI services on one day in time.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The baseline was 0.74% of the population birth to one-year old infants in the EI system (moderate eligibility definition) on one day in time compared to with the national average of 0.99%; and compared to like states, such as Minnesota with 0.67% and Missouri with 0.41% identified. Colorado ranked seventh out of thirteen of the like-definition states.

Colorado State

In FFY 2005, the state was actively engaged in a focused monitoring process to identify questions and probable causes for the low percentage of birth to one-year identification rates. EI programs in the lower quartile of identification were identified through the Part C data system and were the focus of the monitoring activities. The state also investigated causes that resulted in a state systems change and a resulting local change in the supports from the public health system as well as a state system change of referral procedures requiring all children in hospital settings be identified as eligible through Child Find, and refining initial IFSP process for children referred from the NICU.

Baseline Data and Targets FFY 2006:

The Colorado infant birth to one identification rate remained at 0.74% in FFY 2006 compared to the national rate of 0.95% and the rate of 0.89% of other states with a moderate eligibility definition. Comparable states, Minnesota and Missouri, had rates of 0.46% and 0.71% respectively.

Discussion of Targets

The incremental targets for 2005-2010 that were established in FFY 2006 were reviewed in FFY 2008. Effective FFY 2008, state identification rates are compared only to the national average. Based on the progress made in the identification rate, no changes are being made to the established targets at this time.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Colorado's identification rate for infants birth to 1 with IFSPs will be .70%
2006 (2006-2007)	Colorado's identification rate for infants birth to 1 with IFSPs will be .80%
2007 (2007-2008)	Colorado's identification rate for infants birth to 1 with IFSPs will be .90%
2008 (2008-2009)	Colorado's identification rate for infants birth to 1 with IFSPs will be .95%
2009 (2009-2010)	Colorado's identification rate for infants birth to 1 with IFSPs will be 1.0%
2010 (2010-2011)	Colorado's identification rate for infants birth to 1 with IFSPs will be 1.05%
2011 (2011-2012)	Colorado's identification rate for infants birth to 1 with IFSPs will be 1.05%
2012 (2012-2013)	Colorado's identification rate for infants birth to 1 with IFSPs will be 1.05%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

5.1	2005	A notification document will be developed for statewide procedures for early and comprehensive identification of children who are in the public health system (PHS) and who are also eligible for EI services/ former lead agency (CDE) Part C staff and contract staff.
5.2	2005	Focused monitoring activities will be conducted to identify successful outreach to medical and health system personnel for referrals and IFSP development status and need areas/ former lead agency (CDE) state staff and contract staff.
5.3	2006	A state level protocol will be developed for eligibility questions on specific established conditions through the advisement of a state advisory group/ DDD staff, contract staff and advisory group.
5.4	2006	The needs of infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families in the Southern Ute and Ute Mountain Ute Indian Tribes within the State of Colorado explored and defined, and a determination made as to what resources are needed to meet those needs/ DDD staff and contract staff.
5.5	2006	A statewide training will be developed for local communities to support the establishment of local interagency operating agreements that define a referral process for children identified under CAPTA/ DDD staff, Division of Child Welfare staff, and contract staff.
5.6	2006	A technical assistance publication will be developed on guidance for the Primary Care Provider role in referral and ongoing involvement in the IFSP process/ DDD staff, contract staff, and physician advisor on CICC.
5.7	2007	A rigorous definition of developmental delay and categorical eligibility will be developed/ DDD staff, CICC workgroup and key stakeholders.
5.8	2005-2006	Technical assistance will be provided on the identification of babies by hospital personnel and initial IFSP development for infants in the NICU, hospital, or recently discharged infants/ DDD staff, contract staff and contract staff.
5.9	2005-2007	Training on systems collaboration will be developed for HCP and local EI programs through early involvement of PHS staff in the IFSP process/ DDD staff and CDPHE staff.
5.10	2008–2009	DDD will implement revised procedures for focused monitoring that effectively identify root causes of barriers for those CCBs that are low performing on this indicator/ DDD staff.
5.11	2008-2010	Materials will be developed for state and local public awareness and outreach efforts to all families, including those who are homeless or in the child welfare system (including drug affected, foster care and children in cases of substantiated abuse and neglect)/ DDD staff.
5.12	2005-2012	Public awareness materials will be developed or updated for general public, specific populations, in multiple media formats/ DDD staff and contract staff.
5.13	2005-2012	NICU service coordination staff will support early referral and development of initial IFSP and family involvement in NICU settings statewide/ Contract staff.
5.14	2005-2012	Technical assistance to Child Find and EI referral systems on best practices will be provided for outreach to all populations, including child care providers, families who are experiencing homelessness or are involved in the child welfare system (including drug affected, foster care and children in cases of substantiated abuse and neglect)/ DDD staff, Division of Child Welfare state staff and contract staff.

Colorado State

5.15	2006- 2012	Information from TRACE Center website on evidenced based strategies to communicate with physician offices will be reviewed, and information will be integrated into public awareness materials for local offices and disseminated statewide to provide technical assistance on outreach/ DDD staff and contract staff.
5.16	2008- 2012	DDD will monitor all 20 CCBs for compliance on related requirements for Indicator 5, using a combination of data review, self-assessment and onsite data verification visits, issue written notifications of findings of noncompliance, and require POCs when deemed necessary by DDD staff/ DDD staff.

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: See initial description of the SPP development.

In 2005, CDE disseminated a survey to all local Part C coordinators, EI directors of the CCBs, local Child Find coordinators public health team leaders and through the state's higher education listserv. This survey queried local communities about their most recent identification data in order to compare data from years and their knowledge of local characteristics to determine if the community was identifying all eligible children. Targets were established with input of these specific groups, as well as through advisement through the CICC.

Since FFY 2006, DDD staff has developed the revisions to Indicator 6 with input from the CICC, the CICC/MOU sub-committee, CDE Child Find staff, and contracted providers.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 6: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

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

Measurement:

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process in Original SPP:

Population information has been tracked in the Part C database since the early 1990s. See Indicator 5 above for description of Child Find process in Colorado.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004:

The 1.7% birth to three-year-old population with IFSPs reported in the Child Count data was below the average of 2.6% for other states with a moderate eligibility definition and to national data of 2.24%. December 2004 data shows that 2.24% of the birth to three population is identified in the EI system over the course of the full year.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The percentage of infants and toddlers with IFSPs measured by the Child Count data was 1.7% in December 2003 and 2004 and in June 2005. The identification rates for specific communities that were on the higher and lower ranges of state average were investigated, possible reasons for the identification rates identified and verified, technical assistance provided and more consistency was seen statewide in the range of identification. The state EI system continued to track identification rates via twice annual reporting. In Colorado, the overall population growth rate in the state slowed in the past three years. The state ranked in the top percentage of states for median family income. After local investigation of identification rates, several local communities with lower identification rates reported a significant percentage of local families chose to use private insurance coverage for services in private clinical settings rather than the public system of EI services. The majority of Child Find local coordinators reported (survey October 2005) that the identification rates appeared to be appropriate for their communities with the exception of hard to reach populations (e.g., migrant families, undocumented families, monolingual/non-English speaking populations, transient populations). The large metro counties, where identification rates were in the lower quartile, were targeted for support resulting in enhanced child identification activities by both Part C/EI and Part B/619 staff from CDE.

Baseline and Targets for FFY 2006:

The Colorado identification rate of 1.92% is compared to the national rate of 2.34% in FFY 2006 for children birth to three years old and the average rate of 2.72% of other states with a moderate eligibility definition. Comparable states, Minnesota and Missouri, had rates of 1.56% and 1.47% respectively.

Discussion of Targets

The incremental targets for 2005-2010 that were established in FFY 2006 were reviewed in FFY 2008. Effective FFY 2008, state identification rates are compared only to the national average. Based on the progress made in the identification rate, no changes are being made to the established targets at this time.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Colorado's identification rate of infants and toddlers birth to three with IFSPs will be 1.8%
2006 (2006-2007)	Colorado's identification rate for infants and toddlers birth to three with IFSPs will be 2.0%
2007 (2007-2008)	Colorado's identification rate for infants and toddlers birth to three with IFSPs will be 2.2%
2008 (2008-2009)	Colorado's identification rate for infants and toddlers birth to three with IFSPs will be 2.3%
2009 (2009-2010)	Colorado's identification rate for infants and toddlers birth to three with IFSPs will be 2.4%
2010 (2010-2011)	Colorado's identification rate for infants and toddlers birth to three with IFSPs will be 2.5%
2011 (2011-2012)	Colorado's identification rate for infants and toddlers birth to three with IFSPs will be 2.5%
2012 (2012-2013)	Colorado's identification rate for infants and toddlers birth to three with IFSPs will be 2.5%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

6.1	2005	CDE will participate in a grant funded by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (October 2004) to investigate, promote collaboration between the Child Welfare System, EI and Early Care and Education System and disseminate best practices data statewide/ former lead agency (CDE) staff, CDHS/Child Welfare staff, and local EI program staff.
6.2	2005	CDE and Child Welfare will publish a joint letter directing that all children in substantiated cases of abuse and neglect be referred by Child Welfare agencies to the local EI system / former lead agency (CDE) staff and Division of Child Welfare staff.
6.3	2006	DDD will collaborate with Child Welfare to develop a statewide training for local communities to support the establishment of local interagency operating agreements that define a referral process for children identified under CAPTA/ DDD staff, Division of Child Welfare staff, and contract staff.
6.4	2006	A technical assistance publication will be developed on guidance for the Primary Care Provider role in referral and ongoing involvement in the IFSP process/ DDD staff, contract staff, and physician advisor on CICC.
6.5	2006	The needs of infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families in the Southern Ute and Ute Mountain Ute Indian Tribes within the State of Colorado will be explored and defined, and a determination made as to what resources are needed to meet those needs/ DDD staff and contract staff.
6.6	2005-2006	State-level interagency policies and procedures will be developed for state and local public awareness and outreach efforts to families who are homeless or in the child welfare system (including drug affected, foster care and children in cases of substantiated abuse and neglect)/ DDD staff and Child Welfare state staff.
6.7	2006-2007	A rigorous definition of developmental delay and categorical eligibility will be developed/ DDD staff, CICC, and key stakeholders.

6.8	2006-2007	A web-based training and technical assistance paper of procedures for referring all children in substantiated cases of abuse and neglect will be developed/ DDD staff, Division of Child Welfare staff and contract staff.
6.9	2008–2009	DDD will implement revised procedures for focused monitoring that effectively identify root causes of barriers to providing expected child identification/ DDD staff.
6.10	2007-2010	A train the trainer model will be developed for those identifying and working with children with social/emotional needs/ DDD staff, Center for Social Emotional Foundations of Early Learning (CSEFEL), and contract staff.
6.111	2007-2010	Technical assistance materials will be developed to identify and support toddlers with social/emotional needs/ DDD staff; CICC/MOU sub-committee, CSEFEL, and contract staff.
6.12	2005- 2012	Technical assistance to Child Find and EI referral systems on best practices will be provided for outreach to all populations, including child care providers, families who are experiencing homelessness or are involved in the child welfare system (including drug affected, foster care and children in cases of substantiated abuse and neglect)/ DDD staff, Division of Child Welfare state staff and contract staff.
6.13	2006- 2012	Information from TRACE Center website on evidenced based strategies to communicate with physician offices will be reviewed and information will be integrated into public awareness materials for local offices and disseminated statewide to provide technical assistance on outreach/ DDD staff and contract staff.
6.14	2008- 2012	DDD will monitor all 20 CCBs for compliance on related requirements for Indicator 6, using a combination of data review, self-assessment and onsite data verification visits, issue written notifications of findings of noncompliance, and require POCs when deemed necessary by DDD staff/ DDD staff.
6.15	2008- 2012	Materials will be developed for state and local public awareness and outreach efforts to all families, including those who are experiencing homelessness or involved in the child welfare system (including drug affected, foster care and children in cases of substantiated abuse and neglect)/ DDD staff.

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: See initial description of the SPP development.

In 2005, CDE surveyed local Part C coordinators, EI directors at the CCB and Child Find coordinators through CDE listservs, face-to-face meetings and email communication regarding the local system of public awareness, referral and evaluation timelines and documentation. The survey was conducted to review the targets of 100% timely initial evaluation and IFSP meeting unless family circumstances prevent.

Since FFY 2006, DDD developed revised improvement activities for Indicator 7 with input from the CICC and the CICC/MOU sub-committee.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 7: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

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

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

IFSP timeline data has been collected in the Part C database since mid-1990s. Effective FFY 2006, all IFSP data is collected and reported by each of the 20 CCB EI programs.

In Colorado, AUs are responsible for the oversight of Child Find screening and evaluation, birth to 21. This responsibility is monitored under the requirements of federal Part B regulations and state special education law, as well as federal Part C regulations.

Issues of noncompliance of an AU are the responsibility of CDE.

DDD, as the lead agency for Part C, works in conjunction with CDE to identify any child identification issues and to support full compliance of the AUs with the State Child Find statute (ECEA 4.02(1)(a)(i) and CRS 22-20-118). CCBs are responsible for providing public awareness, a referral process, service coordination, and ensuring that the initial IFSP meeting is completed within the 45-day timeline. CCBs are also required to have LICCs which include members from Child Find with whom collaborative relationships ensure an effective child identification system.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004:

Colorado did not have data in the Part C database until December 1, 2005 reporting the percentage of children who have an evaluation and an initial IFSP meeting within 45 days of the date of referral or have documented exceptional family reasons for extending the timeline.

The data for the baseline was updated by February 2006 after the December 1, 2005 data submission. See below for discussion.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

In December 2004, 96.8% of all children received a multidisciplinary evaluation, and 60.67% had a multidisciplinary evaluation and completed an IFSP within the 45-day timeline. Previously, this number included those families who had requested that the timeline be extended.

December 2005 was the first time that Colorado had data on the initial IFSP meeting timeline in the Part C database. Data from previous years were collected on completion of the IFSP, including identifying all services and service providers. According to a survey of Child Find coordinators in October 2005, approximately 90% of extended timelines were due to family circumstances and 10% of delays were caused by child identification system issues. The issues identified were staffing challenges (e.g., illness, unexpected vacancies, inability to fill vacant positions for long periods of time) and periodic high numbers of referrals at a particular point in time.

Colorado State

In February 2004, CDE conducted interviews with all communities who were developing, or had just completed, the Continuous Improvement Planning process. At the time of the interviews, it was reported across communities that 95% of the time AUs completed the initial evaluation and held the initial IFSP meeting within the 45-day timeline. The issues identified in the cases of untimely initial IFSP meetings that did not pertain to family circumstance were episodic large numbers of children referred in a short time frame, and in the few AUs where meeting timelines was an issue, Child Find teams had difficulty scheduling or were not available.

The above issues were consistent with the October 2005 survey. Part B 619 staff was notified of the AUs where timelines for evaluation were out of compliance and work with those AUs began in 2005 and support continues from Part B staff.

Due to changes that occurred in the data system, the May 15, 2006 report indicated that, accounting for family reasons, the percentage of IFSPs completed in a timely manner was 78.6%. The use of the more accurate data collection and reporting provides an improved system for measuring compliance to Indicator 7.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting will be conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting will be conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting will be conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting will be conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting will be conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting will be conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.
2011 (2011-2012)	100% of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting will be conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.
2012 (2012-2013)	100% of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting will be conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

7.1	2007	DDD will collaborate with CDE to revise the state Memorandum of Understanding that includes strategies to improve compliance with the multidisciplinary evaluation and 45-day timeline requirements/ DDD and CDE staff.
7.2	2007	Technical assistance will be provided to CCBs to implement the new Child Find legislation/ DDD staff.
7.3	2007	Technical assistance will be provided to CCBs to develop interagency operating agreements with their administrative units regarding procedures to meet the requirements related to Indicator 7/ DDD staff.
7.4	2007	The state data system will be revised to collect more accurate and reliable data for Indicator 7 and to enable the state to better track progress or slippage/ DDD staff.
7.5	2007-2010	The state EI rules will be revised to incorporate changes to the Child Find legislation (CRS 27-10.5-140)/ DDD staff.
7.6	2008-2010	DDD will develop a process for funding CCBs to reimburse private providers for team consultation and attendance at IFSP meetings/ DDD staff.
7.7	2008-2010	DDD will provide training and technical assistance to CCBs on appropriate identification of family vs. system reasons for delays/ DDD staff.
7.8	2008-2010	DDD will collaborate with CDE to ensure that vision and hearing screenings occur for infants and toddlers during eligibility evaluations and initial assessments/ DDD and CDE staff.
7.9	2008-2010	DDD will implement revised procedures for focused monitoring that effectively identify root causes of barriers for those CCBs that are low performing on this indicator/ DDD staff.
7.10	2008-2010	DDD will provide technical assistance to CCBs to increase funding for service coordination through expanding the number of eligible children and families served through Medicaid Targeted Case Management/ DDD staff.
7.11	2008-2010	Materials for families about the IFSP process, with an explanation of the multidisciplinary evaluation and IFSP development, will be developed and distributed statewide/ DDD staff and contract staff.
7.12	2005- 2012	Service Coordination Core Competencies Training with a module on the IFSP process, including evaluation process and timelines will continue to be provided/ DDD staff and contract staff.
7.13	2006- 2012	CCBs will develop, implement and revise interagency operating agreements with their local AUs to ensure timely evaluations and assessments and initial IFSPs/ DDD staff, CCBs, and LICCs members.
7.14	2008- 2012	DDD will monitor all twenty CCBs for compliance on Indicator 7, using a combination of data review, self-assessment and onsite data verification visits, issue written notifications of noncompliance, and require POCs when noncompliance is identified/ DDD staff.
7.15	2011-2012	DDD will update training and technical assistance materials to support the revised state EI rules related to Indicator 7/ DDD staff.

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: See initial description of the SPP development.

In June 2005, the EI system, including AUs and local education agencies (LEAs), completed compliance requirements under a federal compliance plan for timely transitions for children exiting out of EI services at age three. Local early childhood systems (the local Part C coordinator, EI director, Child Find and LEA personnel at a minimum in each community) all participated in a thorough review of transition requirements under IDEA between September 2004-November 2004, and submitted a joint analysis of transition processes and compliance plans to assure compliance with IDEA transition requirements by June 2005, including notification, IFSP planning and timelines.

Since FFY 2006, DDD has developed the revised improvement activities for Indicator 8 with input from the CICC and the CICC/MOU sub-committee.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Indicator 8: Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:

- A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;
- B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and
- C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.

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

Measurement:

- A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(# of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services)}}{\text{(# of children exiting Part C times)}} \right] 100$.
- B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred)}}{\text{(# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \text{ times } 100$.
- C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred)}}{\text{(# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \text{ times } 100$.

Account for untimely transition conferences, including reasons for delays.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The EI system, including the CDE Part B staff, completed requirements under a federal compliance plan for timely transitions in June 2005. Local early childhood systems refined their transition processes and procedures to achieve timely transitions, created plans with all necessary steps and services included, notified the LEAs so as they could be part of the planning process and documented the process. All local EI interagency groups had written transition agreements that included policy and procedures for timelines, notification, transition planning and plans. They were all aware and informed of the requirements for 100% compliance targets.

CCBs are responsible for notifying the LEA of children exiting EI services who are potentially eligible for Part B services early enough to begin effective planning. CCB service coordinators are responsible for initiating transition planning, writing IFSP transition plans that include steps and services, and convening the transition conference at least 90 days before a child's third birthday to ensure an effective transition. The local Child Find teams are responsible for determining Part B eligibility and participating in the transition planning conference.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004-2005:

A.

June 2005 – Ninety-five percent (95%) of all children exiting EI services had IFSPs with transition plans including steps and services by 90 days prior to a third birthday. Five percent (5%) of the IFSPs were not timely and of those, one percent (1%) was due to systems issues. Part B staff at the State Education Agency (SEA) was notified of the four percent (4%) of issues that were LEA-related and instituted follow up procedures with those few LEAs.

B.

June 2005 – One hundred percent (100%) of local interagency groups had written interagency operating agreements with procedures to notify the LEA. In a survey Sept. – Nov. 2005, all EI programs documented that as of Fall 2005 the LEA was notified of all 100% potentially eligible children. This was documented through local community database analysis of records. Individual child record documentation of LEA notification in the Part C database was tracked with an added data field beginning Dec. 2, 2005.

C.

June 2005 – Ninety-five percent (95%) of all children exiting EI services, including those eligible for Part B, had IFSPs with transition plans and transition conferences occurred. This was documented through local community database analysis of records. Five percent (5%) of the transition conferences were not timely and of those, one percent (1%) were due to systems issues and four percent (4%) of the issues that were LEA related were referred to Part B state staff for follow up within their monitoring system in FFY 2005.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

In June 2005, 22 out of 25 communities that had been on compliance plans for the transition process were in 100% compliance with meeting the 90-day timeline for holding a transition meeting and having complete plans. Following June 2005, the three communities were under a one year Continuous Improvement Plan for transition processes. Seven of the 32 previous EI programs were in compliance with transition timelines and plan requirements. Intensive work was done at the state and local level to analyze the state and local issues contributing to noncompliance on the transition process. The state developed and provided training and technical assistance materials statewide. Specific plans to address the issues were developed locally, steps taken and corrections were made to address the compliance issues. The EI systems issues identified and corrected were: lack of documentation, lack of timely initiation of transition requirements and difficulty with coordinating all required elements for transition planning and completion. The documentation of notification in the individual child record began December 2, 2005 with the most updated version of the Part C database. Training on the new elements of the database helped to assure accurate reporting. CDE notified all former EI programs in writing once they completed their transition compliance plans and complimented the local system on their significant achievement.

Prior to June 2006, the Part C database did not contain a field for documenting the reason of a late transition plan. The database has been revised to include a field to capture this information that allows for more accurate reporting.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2005 (2005-2006)</p>	<p>A) 100% of all children exiting Part C will have IFSPs with transition steps and services.</p> <p>B) 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B will have notification to the LEA occur.</p> <p>C) 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B will have a timely transition conference.</p>
<p>2006 (2006-2007)</p>	<p>A) 100% of all children exiting Part C will have IFSPs with transition steps and services.</p> <p>B) 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B will have notification to the LEA occur.</p> <p>C) 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B will have a timely transition conference.</p>

<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p>	<p>A) 100% of all children exiting Part C will have IFSPs with transition steps and services. B) 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B will have notification to the LEA occur. C) 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B will have a timely transition conference.</p>
<p>2008 (2008-2009)</p>	<p>A) 100% of all children exiting Part C will have IFSPs with transition steps and services. B) 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B will have notification to the LEA occur. C) 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B will have a timely transition conference.</p>
<p>2009 (2009-2010)</p>	<p>A) 100% of all children exiting Part C will have IFSPs with transition steps and services. B) 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B will have notification to the LEA occur. C) 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B will have a timely transition conference.</p>
<p>2010 (2010-2011)</p>	<p>A) 100% of all children exiting Part C will have IFSPs with transition steps and services. B) 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B will have notification to the LEA occur. C) 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B will have a timely transition conference.</p>
<p>2011 (2011-2012)</p>	<p>A) 100% of all children exiting Part C will have IFSPs with transition steps and services. B) 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B will have notification to the LEA occur. C) 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B will have a timely transition conference.</p>
<p>2012 (2012-2013)</p>	<p>A) 100% of all children exiting Part C will have IFSPs with transition steps and services. B) 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B will have notification to the LEA occur. C) 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B will have a timely transition conference.</p>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

<p>8.1</p>	<p>2005</p>	<p>Training and technical assistance will be provided to three local interagency groups to develop the continuous improvement plan to come into compliance with IDEA transition requirements within one year from the citation (January 2006)/ former lead agency (CDE) Part C and Part B 619 staff.</p>
------------	-------------	--

8.2	2005	Technical assistance will be provided through documents and web-based resources from lead agency/ former lead agency (CDE) Part C and Part B/619 staff and contract staff.
8.3	2005	Regional topical meetings with follow up technical assistance on transition will be conducted with Child Find coordinators / former lead agency (CDE) Part C and Part B 619 staff.
8.4	2007	State policies, procedures, forms, and interagency operating agreements will be revised to ensure compliance with transition requirements/ DDD staff and CICC/MOU sub-committee.
8.5	2007	The CCMSWeb web-based data system will be revised to ensure all key data points for transition are captured to ensure validity and reliability of the data from all CCBs/ DDD staff.
8.6	2005-2008	A parent training module on IFSP process, including transition, will be developed and implemented statewide through regional training/ DDD staff, Training Cadre, and PEAK Parent Center mentors.
8.7	2007-2008	DDD staff will collaborate with CDE to identify AUs or LEAs and CCBs that need state level technical assistance to meet transition requirements/ DDD staff and CDE staff.
8.8	2007-2009	A parent handbook on transition will be developed and disseminated/ DDD staff, CICC, and contractors.
8.9	2008-2009	The transition module within the state IFSP training will be revised to provide more detail on required timelines for transition and the content of transition plans. This training will be provided to EI service coordinators, early interventionists and community partners throughout the state/ DDD Staff, Training Cadre.
8.10	2008-2009	Workshop on Part C to B transition for parents and early interventionists will be provided at the <i>Conference on Inclusive Education</i> / DDD Staff, Training Cadre.
8.11	2008-2009	DDD will implement revised procedures for focused monitoring that effectively identify root causes of barriers for those CCBs that are low performing on this indicator/ DDD staff.
8.12	2008-2010	DDD will revise the state IFSP transition section to provide guidance to IFSP team members on required content for transition steps and services/ DDD staff.
8.13	2006-2012	CCBs will develop, implement and revise interagency operating agreements (IAs) with their LEAs to ensure timely transitions for children exiting EI services and entering preschool services at age three/ DDD staff, local CCBs, and LICCs.
8.14	2006-2012	Training on transition requirements will be continued for service coordinators in required Service Coordination Core Competencies Training/ DDD staff and contract staff.
8.15	2007-2012	DDD staff will collaborate with CDE to revise the Memorandum of Understanding to address new state statutes and rules, and new federal requirements related to transition, if necessary/ DDD staff and CDE staff.
8.16	2008-2012	DDD will monitor all 20 CCBs for compliance on Indicators 8A, 8B and 8C, using a combination of data review, self-assessment and onsite data verification visits, issue written notifications of noncompliance, and require POCs when deemed necessary by DDD staff/ DDD staff.
8.17	2011-2012	DDD will revise update training and technical assistance materials to support the revised state EI rules related to Indicator 8/ DDD staff.

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: See initial description of the SPP development.

The focused monitoring system approach under CDE was developed over the FFY 2004-2005 year and involved input specifically from the CICC/MOU sub-committee.

Since July 2006, DDD has developed revised improvement activities to address the general supervision system in Colorado with input from the CICC, the CICC/MOU sub-committee, the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC), and a private national consultant.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 9: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

(20 U.S.C. 141 6(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: (OSEP Revision for 2007 APR)

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

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

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

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

In FFY 2003, CDE conducted four Community Infant Services Reviews (CISRs) by an interagency team with representation from the lead agency, state agency partners, and parents. In FFY 2005, Colorado implemented a data-guided focused monitoring approach to identify areas of noncompliance and to measure and track improvement for those programs identified as out of compliance with Part C requirements.

In FFY 2005, CDE's monitoring of Part C in Colorado was a continuous process involving review of annual applications for Part C funding, analysis of semi-annual progress reporting, semi-annual child count data, community self assessment, complaint investigation, requests for training and technical assistance, and focused monitoring activities to examine compliance with specific components of Part C requirements.

Beginning July 2006, due to the change in lead agency, DDD assumed responsibility for the general administration, supervision, and monitoring of all EI supports and services used by the state to comply with Part C of IDEA and state statutes. The general supervision system in Colorado is focused on improving the developmental outcomes for children and families. Monitoring activities ensure compliance with Part C of IDEA regulations, state EI rules, and the vision articulated by the CICC. General supervision procedures were put into place that included an onsite monitoring of all CCBs every two years, file reviews, analysis of reports from the state data system, complaint investigation, fiscal audits and focused monitoring.

In FFY 2007, the general supervision policies and procedures were revised to more effectively ensure: the identification of noncompliance; the use of drill down activities to define the specific causes of noncompliance; and the timely correction of noncompliance as soon as possible but no later than one year from notification. Changes were made in the public reporting and determination process for local programs. These revisions included the addition of criteria that measure compliance and performance on Indicators 1-8, timely and accurate submission of data, timely and accurate fiscal audits, the timely correction of noncompliance, and timely resolution of due process disputes or complaints.

Stakeholders in the General Supervision System

A key component to the general supervision system in Colorado is an interagency process that includes participation from the DDD, state and local interagency partners, representatives from CCBs, members of the CICC, and parent and professional members of LICCs.

Sources of Information

DDD meets its responsibilities for quality assurance and general supervision in a variety of ways, including:

- Promulgation of rules
- Development of standards, directives and interpretative guidelines
- Conduct of onsite data verification and monitoring of 20 CCBs
- Focused monitoring, as needed
- Complaint investigations
- Review of web-reported performance data
- Desk analysis of compliance data
- Annual family outcomes surveys
- Child outcomes data
- Support for local service provider self-assessment and quality improvement projects
- Training and technical assistance
- Coordination of fiscal monitoring activities with the DDD Finance and Program Quality Sections

Enforcement

One way in which DDD ensures timely correction of noncompliance by a CCB is the issuance of a plan of correction (POC). For each area in which a finding of noncompliance is made, a POC lists the specific related requirements and deficiencies identified. Benchmarks are set for the agency to document evidence of change in order to reach compliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the written notification of the noncompliance. A template which identifies specific strategies and activities that need to be accomplished in order to achieve compliance is provided to the CCB. Each CCB with an open POC is assigned a state staff person to provide them with technical assistance through the span of the POC.

After a CCB signs acceptance of the POC, regular follow-up is conducted to monitor the agency progress toward timely correcting identified deficiencies. Methods used for ongoing review of progress include:

- Additional Document Review: DDD may request copies of key documents (program outreach materials, interagency agreements, additional file or data reviews) that enable staff to determine whether the agency is correcting the cited deficiencies;
- Progress Reports: DDD may request that the agency provide periodic (e.g., monthly or quarterly) written documentation to confirm its progress in implementing an agency POC;
- Onsite Monitoring Review: The Program Quality Coordinator and, where needed, additional DDD staff or interagency partners may revisit the agency to review agency records and records of children receiving services and interview staff to determine if the agency has made adequate progress in implementing its POC. Upon completion of an onsite review, DDD provides a report to the agency indicating for each POC reviewed whether the deficiency was timely corrected, partially corrected or not corrected within one year from written notification of noncompliance;
- Resolution of identified noncompliance: After DDD has verified that a CCB with a finding of noncompliance has timely corrected the deficiency, and (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has initiated services for each child, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the CCB EI program, consistent with the October 17, 2008 *OSEP Memorandum 09-02*, (*OSEP Memo 09-02*) a written notification of release is sent; and
- Enforcement Actions: If a CCB does not timely correct noncompliance, DDD applies appropriate enforcement actions.

In addition to the onsite surveys, desk audits of the data system and focused monitoring are used by DDD to examine the performance of the EI programs. Annually, DDD makes status determinations of each CCB in relation to the performance of the program on the compliance and performance indicators of the SPP. In addition, DDD considers: whether data submitted by a CCB is timely, valid, and reliable; if, noncompliance from other sources is corrected; and any audit findings.

Colorado State

Status determinations are made using the following four categories:

- Meets Requirements
- Needs Assistance
- Needs Intervention
- Needs Substantial Intervention

CCBs are informed of their annual status determination, and reporting of the performance of each CCB on Indicators 1-8 is made public on an annual basis. The report is posted on the EI Colorado website, www.eicolorado.org and is made available in printed format to the public and key stakeholders.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004-2005:

A. Percent of noncompliance related to monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:

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

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, the following actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement were taken:

- In 29% of priority areas monitored through comprehensive monitoring, there were local findings of noncompliance in FFY 2003. Of these, 71% were corrected within one year.
- In FFY 2003, comprehensive monitoring identified seven instances of noncompliance with SPP priority areas.
- Indicator 4: one program out of compliance
- Indicator 7: three programs out of compliance
- Indicator 8: three programs out of compliance
- Of the seven areas of noncompliance identified through comprehensive monitoring in FFY 2003, five were corrected within one year from identification. The five areas corrected were:
 - Indicator 4: one out of one (100%) corrected within one year
 - Indicator 7: one out of three programs (33%) corrected within one year
 - Indicator 8: three out of three (100%) corrected within one year

Onsite technical assistance was provided to the EI programs with the two areas of noncompliance that were not corrected within one year. Improvement was documented in all areas that did not show full compliance within one year. Technical assistance included training provided to local program administrators, service coordinators, service providers, and Child Find evaluation teams to increase understanding of and compliance with the requirements under Part C of IDEA. Representatives from stakeholder agencies on the state CICC/MOU sub-committee assisted in the reorganization and reallocation of staff and resources in the programs to support improvement in compliance with Part C requirements. Data from those communities that did not achieve full compliance within one year was collected in December and June and reviewed by the lead agency to monitor for improvement and full compliance. Technical assistance was provided to assist communities in the collection of data that accurately reflects the situation in the community in regards to compliance. Noncompliance findings related to Child Find that were revealed during onsite monitoring activities were referred to the state Part B Child Find Coordinator for follow-up monitoring.

B. Percent of noncompliance related to areas not included in the above monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:

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

Colorado State

During FFY 2003, the Colorado comprehensive monitoring system reviewed child identification rates compared to statewide averages. Three of the four EI programs monitored were found to have identification rates below the statewide average. Onsite monitoring investigated the identification rate in each community and determined that each program monitored had a sufficient system of public awareness and determined that identification rates for Part C/EI were appropriate in each of the programs investigated.

- C. Percent of noncompliance identified through other mechanisms (complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc.) corrected within one year of identification:
- FFY 2003 - no programs were named in a complaint in which noncompliance was identified
 - FFY 2003 - no findings of noncompliance were made
 - FFY 2003 - the Part C system had one complaint with no findings; there were no corrections needed.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004-2005:

A. Percent of noncompliance related to monitoring priority areas and year of identification:

- # of findings of noncompliance made related to priority areas.
- # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

In 48% of priority areas monitored through comprehensive monitoring, there were local findings of noncompliance in FFY 2004. Of the EI programs with plans due in FFY 2005, six of 13 (46%) findings were corrected in that year. The remaining programs had plans that required correction in FFY 2006.

In FFY 2004, comprehensive monitoring identified 13 instances of noncompliance with SPP Priority Areas.

- Indicator 2: two findings of noncompliance, two (100%) corrected in less than one year
- Indicator 6: two findings of noncompliance, scheduled to timely correct as soon as possible but no later than one year
- Indicator 7: two findings of noncompliance, scheduled to timely correct as soon as possible but no later than one year

CDE identified that four programs were out of compliance and three corrected within one year. For FFY 2004, there were no uncorrected noncompliance findings. In the SPP submitted in FFY 2005, CDE did not specify which programs had findings in which indicators. It had been less than one year since the monitoring reports were issued and CDE was scheduled to conduct follow-up monitoring in FFY 2006.

- B. Percent of noncompliance identified through other mechanisms (complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc.) corrected within one year of identification:
- FFY 2004 - one complaint resulted in four findings of noncompliance
 - FFY 2004 - four findings of noncompliance were corrected in less than one year from identification

Discussion of Baseline Data:

CDE annually monitored the local grant applications for Part C funds and submission of the former EI programs Continuation Plans. The Continuation Plan, based upon local self-assessment information, described a community's progress towards achieving compliance with the state and federal requirements under Part C of IDEA. Year-end progress reports were submitted by the EI programs and reviewed by the lead agency at the end of the fiscal year. These reports documented progress (or slippage) that was achieved on the outcomes identified in the Continuation Plans. In addition, CDE provided general supervision through the use of: desk audits; onsite monitoring; focused monitoring; complaint investigation; requests for technical assistance; surveys of parents, service providers, or local administrators; and concerns identified by the CICC.

In FFY 2003, four EI programs were monitored by CDE using a comprehensive onsite monitoring process. The four communities were selected based on a cyclical system to assure that all communities were monitored within a five-year period. In addition to comprehensive onsite monitoring, summary reports and community ranking reports were developed and reviewed based upon child count data collected semi-annually on all children with IFSPs in Colorado. Follow up with local programs in the lower quartile of the rankings resulted in corrected data or specific technical assistance to address the issues identified.

Colorado State

During the FFY 2003 cycle of comprehensive monitoring, it was determined that several programs were submitting data that did not accurately portray the situation regarding the timeline from initial referral to the Part C system to development of the IFSP. Changes were made to the state data system to correct this situation. Technical assistance was provided to communities to assure that the data regarding referral to IFSP timelines was correctly and accurately recorded.

CDE moved to a focused monitoring system in FFY 2004 and followed all programs on all SPP monitoring priorities, as well as following specific programs through focused monitoring on noncompliance points identified through multiple data sources. During FFY 2005, the state-collected data was to be reviewed to assure that appropriate information was collected to accurately measure compliance in all priority areas of the SPP.

Follow-up on the data review was based upon the results of the review and appropriate actions to the issue pursued. Based on December 1, 2005 Child Count data, programs that were out of compliance on SPP priority areas were issued a noncompliance letter and were required to submit POCs.

Due to the change in lead agency in July 2006, these plans were not monitored by CDE. Only two of the 32 former EI programs that developed POCs continued to provide services after July 1, 2006. DDD reviewed the POCs for these two programs. Both timely corrected areas of noncompliance and were issued letters releasing them from their POCs.

DDD monitors all 20 CCBs on Indicators 1-8, Part C related requirements, and state EI rules through onsite surveys and annual analysis of data collected from the statewide data system.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	The general supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects 100% of noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.
2006 (2006-2007)	The general supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects 100% of noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.
2007 (2007-2008)	The general supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects 100% of noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.
2008 (2008-2009)	The general supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects 100% of noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.
2009 (2009-2010)	The general supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects 100% of noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.
2010 (2010-2011)	The general supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects 100% of noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.
2011 (2011-2012)	The general supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects 100% of noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.
2012 (2012-2013)	The general supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects 100% of noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

9.1	2005	Data from focused monitoring activities on the referral and IFSP process in NICU's will be gathered and analyzed/ former lead agency (CDE) Part C staff and contract staff.
-----	------	---

9.2	2005	The Part C state database will be utilized to incorporate all required data elements for federal and state reporting purposes/ former lead agency (CDE) Part C staff and contract staff.
9.3	2006	Based on December 1, 2006 Child Count Data, desk audits will be conducted on all indicators, determinations will be made and compliance plans will be issued in Winter 2007/ DDD staff.
9.4	2007	State policies, procedures, and contracts will be revised to ensure compliance with state and federal requirements / DDD staff.
9.5	2007	Plans of Correction will be issued to those CCBs who show noncompliance in any area and progress will be measured in Summer 2007 to inform technical assistance and focused monitoring/ DDD staff.
9.6	2007	The database will be converted to a web-based system by Fall 2007/ DDD staff.
9.7	2007	The CCMS web-based data system will be revised to ensure all key data points for Indicators 1-8 are captured to ensure validity and reliability of the data from all CCBs/ DDD staff.
9.8	2007	DDD will revise the General Supervision and Monitoring Manual to include all of the OSEP critical elements/ DDD staff.
9.9	2006-2009	DDD will ensure CCBs develop POCs that meet state requirements for areas of noncompliance identified through any monitoring activity/ DDD staff.
9.10	2006-2009	In collaboration with the Legal Center for People with Disabilities and Older People, DDD will provide annual training on Part C of IDEA to mediators and hearing officers/ DDD staff and Legal Center staff.
9.11	2008-2009	DDD will reassign state staff and create the position of Plan of Correction Coordinator who will be responsible for tracking correction of noncompliance/ DDD staff.
9.12	2005-2012	DDD will monitor all communities on all SPP priority areas through statewide database and follow up investigation/ DDD staff.
9.13	2006-2012	DDD will continue to provide annual database trainings and ongoing technical assistance for local data managers / DDD staff.
9.14	2006-2012	DDD will report annually to the public on the performance of the state and each CCB on the targets for Indicators 1-8 in the SPP by posting on the EI Colorado website and distribution to the media and public agencies/ DDD staff and CICC.
9.15	2006-2012	The CCMSWeb database will be utilized to measure all required state and federal data reports/ DDD staff.
9.16	2007-2012	DDD will annually disseminate a list of possible state enforcement actions for noncompliance extending beyond one year and apply appropriate enforcement actions/ DDD staff.
9.17	2008-2012	DDD will provide data queries that CCBs can use for self-assessment to monitor their progress in correcting noncompliance/ DDD staff.
9.18	2008-2012	DDD will assign state staff to lead technical assistance activities with CCBs as needed/ DDD staff.
9.19	2008-2012	DDD will monitor all 20 CCBs for compliance on all Indicators using a combination of data review, self-assessment and onsite data verification visits, issue written notifications of findings of noncompliance, and require POCs when deemed necessary by DDD staff/ DDD staff.

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: See initial description of the SPP development.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 10: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

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

Measurement: Percent = (1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by (1 .1) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process: CDE followed the Part B mediation and complaint process. As of June 2005, CDE began logging in all calls or letters of inquiry or issues that did not meet the criteria of a signed written complaint under IDEA.

DDD followed the former policies for mediation and complaint processes, but now follows the revised policies in the 2010 EI Colorado State Plan.

Families are notified of their rights under IDEA for mediation, complaint and due process by service coordinators, Child Find staff and/or local administration staff upon entry, at IFSP review and at any time the family expresses concerns appropriate for the process. Written information is provided to families, as well as explained verbally. Families with questions are encouraged to call the state EI program at DDD. DDD logs complaints and follows the procedures for the complaint process.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004:

One signed written complaint was made in FFY 2004.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Historically, Colorado has not received many requests for mediation, complaints or due process cases. The trend in the past three years has been zero to one filing of a formal complaint. All complaints have been resolved within the 60-day time requirement.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline will be extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline will be extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline will be extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline will be extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline will be extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline will be extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
2011 (2011-2012)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline will be extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

2012 (2012-2013)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline will be extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
----------------------------	---

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

10.1	2005	Parent training curriculum and materials about the IFSP process with an emphasis on procedural safeguards will be developed and disseminated/ former lead agency (CDE) Part C staff, Training Cadre, PEAK Parent Center, and contract staff.
10.2	2007	A technical assistance brief on procedural safeguards to all of the CCBs for use in conjunction with IFSP meetings will be developed and disseminated/ DDD staff and contract staff.
10.3	2005-2007	The <i>Welcome Packet</i> , which includes a copy of their rights under IDEA to the complaint process, will be distributed to all families entering the EI system in the state/ DDD staff and contract staff.
10.4	2006-2008	Parent training will be provided regionally, including trainings in Spanish, and materials will be disseminated statewide/ DDD staff, PEAK Parent Center, and contract staff.
10.5	2006-2008	A Cultural Competence Workgroup will address the provision of culturally and linguistically appropriate supports and services in the context of families procedural safeguards/ DDD staff and Cultural Competence Workgroup members.
10.6	2008-2012	DDD will provide training and technical assistance on child and family rights and procedural safeguards to all of the CCBs for use in conjunction with IFSP meetings, including guidance documents as to when parents must be provided notice of their rights and procedural safeguards as well as strategies for ensuring that families understand those rights/ DDD staff and contract staff.
10.7	2008-2012	The <i>Family Rights: Notice of Child and Family Rights and Procedural Safeguards in the Early Intervention Colorado System</i> , which describes family rights and procedural safeguards under IDEA including the dispute resolution and complaint process, will be distributed to all families entering the EI system in the state and at each point notice of rights is required/ DDD staff.
10.8	2005-2012	Service Coordination Core Competencies Training will be conducted two-three times annually, including service coordinator responsibilities for informing parents of their rights under IDEA, including the complaint process/ DDD staff and contract staff.
10.9	2005-2012	All complaint investigations will be conducted within the timeline required and reports of findings as defined in IDEA will be issued/ DDD staff.
10.10	2011-2012	DDD will provide training regarding Part C of IDEA for all hearing and mediation officers to update their understanding of rules and regulations/ DDD staff and contract staff.

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: See initial description of SPP development.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 11: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.

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

Measurement:

Percent = (3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by (3.2) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

CDE followed the Part B mediation and complaint process. As of June 2005, began logging in all calls or letters of inquiry or issues that do not meet the criteria of a signed written complaint under IDEA.

DDD originally followed the former policies for due process hearing requests, but now follows the revised policies in the 2010 EI Colorado State Plan.

Families are notified of their rights under IDEA for mediation, complaint and due process by service coordinators, Child Find staff and/or local administration staff upon entry, at IFSP review and at any time the family expresses concerns appropriate for the process. Written information is provided to families as well as explained verbally. Families with questions are encouraged to call the state EI office at DDD. DDD logs hearing requests and follows the procedures for the due process hearing requests.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004:

There were no due process hearing requests in FFY 2004.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Historically, Colorado has not received many requests for mediation, complaints or due process cases. The trend in the past three years has been either zero to one request of mediation and filing of a formal complaint. The State did not have any fully adjudicated due process hearing requests.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.
2011 (2011-2012)	100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.
2012 (2012-2013)	100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

11.1	2005	Develop and pilot parent training curriculum, and materials about IFSP process, with an emphasis on procedural safeguards/ former lead agency (CDE) Part C state staff, Training Cadre and PEAK Parent Center.
------	------	--

11.2	2007	2008 Develop and disseminate a technical assistance brief on procedural safeguards for all of the CCBs to use in conjunction with IFSP meetings/ DDD staff and contract staff.
11.3	2005-2007	The <i>Welcome Packet</i> will be provided to all families entering the EI system in the state that includes a copy of their rights under IDEA, including their right to due process/ DDD staff.
11.4	2006-2008	Provide parent training regionally and disseminate materials statewide/ DDD staff, Training Cadre, PEAK Parent Center, and contract staff.
11.5	2006-2008	Provide parent training regionally, including trainings in Spanish, and disseminate materials statewide/ DDD staff, PEAK Parent Center, and contract staff.
11.6	2006-2008	A cultural competence workgroup will address the provision of culturally and linguistically appropriate supports and services in the context of families' procedural safeguards/ DDD staff and workgroup.
11.7	2008-2009	Provide training and technical assistance on child and family rights and procedural safeguards to all of the CCBs for use in conjunction with IFSP meetings, including guidance documents as to when parents must be provided notice of their rights and procedural safeguards as well as strategies for ensuring that families understand those rights / DDD staff and contract staff.
11.8	2008-2012	The <i>Family Rights: Notice of Child and Family Rights and Procedural Safeguards in the Early Intervention Colorado System</i> , which describes family rights and procedural safeguards under IDEA including the dispute resolution and complaint process, will be distributed to all families entering the EI system in the state and at each point notice of rights is required/ DDD staff.
11.9	2006-2012	Annual contracts will be developed with CCBs that contain assurances and plans for meeting those assurances, including the assurance that all families know their rights under IDEA their right to due process and follow-up by programs on their plans/strategies/ DDD staff.
11.10	2005-2012	The Service Coordination Core Competencies Training will continue to be provided two-three times annually, including service coordinator responsibilities for informing parents of their rights under IDEA, including the complaint process/ DDD staff and contract staff.

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: See initial description of SPP development.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 12: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).

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

Measurement:

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

CDE followed the Part B mediation and complaint process and as of June 2005, began logging in all calls or letters of inquiry or issues that do not meet the criteria of a signed written complaint under IDEA.

DDD originally followed the former policies for due process hearing requests, but now follows the revised policies in the 2010 EI Colorado State Plan.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004:

This was a new indicator and CDE did not set a baseline because there were fewer than 10 hearing requests.

Discussion of Baseline Data

Historically, Colorado has not received many requests for mediation, complaints or due process cases. The trend in the past three years had been zero to one request of mediation and filing of a formal complaint. All complaints were resolved within the 60-day time requirement. The one request for mediation was successfully mediated under the timeline required. The State has not had any resolution sessions to date.

DDD has not adopted Part B due process procedures, therefore target measurements for Indicator 12 are not applicable for Colorado.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Not applicable
2006 (2006-2007)	Not applicable
2007 (2007-2008)	Not applicable
2008 (2008-2009)	Not applicable
2009 (2009-2010)	Not applicable
2010 (2010-2011)	Not applicable
2011 (2011-2012)	Not applicable
2012 (2012-2013)	Not applicable

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Not applicable.

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: See initial description of SPP development.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 13: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Measurement:

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by (2.1) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

CDE followed the Part B mediation and complaint process and as of June 2005, began logging in all calls or letters of inquiry or issues that do not meet the criteria of a signed written complaint under IDEA.

DDD originally followed the former policies for mediation, but now follows the revised policies in the 2010 EI Colorado State Plan.

Families are notified of their rights under IDEA for mediation, complaint and due process by service coordinators, Child Find staff and/or local administration staff upon entry, at IFSP review and at any time the family expresses concerns appropriate for the process. Written information is provided to families as well as explained verbally. Families with questions are encouraged to call the state EI office at DDD. DDD logs complaints and follows the procedures for the complaint process.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004:

No mediations have been requested or held that resulted in mediation agreements.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Historically, Colorado has not received many requests for mediation, complaints or due process cases. The trend in the past three years has been either zero to one request of mediation and filing of a formal complaint. One request for mediation was made in FFY 2005-2006 and successfully mediated and resolved under the timeline required. If Colorado reaches the OSEP-set minimum of 10 mediations per year, then a baseline will be determined.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Not applicable
2006 (2006-2007)	Not applicable
2007 (2007-2008)	Not applicable
2008 (2008-2009)	Not applicable
2009 (2009-20 10)	Not applicable
2010 (2010-2011)	Not applicable
2011 (2011-2012)	Not applicable
2012 (2012-2013)	Not applicable

Colorado State

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

To be established if Colorado reaches a minimum of 10 or more mediations per year.

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: See initial description of SPP development.

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

Indicator 14: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

(20 U.S.C. 141 6(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: (OSEP Revision for 2007 APR)
--

State reported data, including 618 data, State performance plan, and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count and settings and November 1 for exiting and dispute resolution); and
- b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement.

States are required to use the "Indicator 14 Data Rubric" for reporting data for this indicator (see Attachment B).

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Part C data system was established in the early 1990s and has been continually upgraded. Data collection occurred on an ongoing basis at the local level and entered by a local data manager or local service coordination staff. Until Fall 2007, an Access database was used that was password protected at the local level and submitted to the state data coordinator in a zipped electronic file through secured transmission twice annually. The data was "cleaned" and checked for validity and accuracy. The state data coordinator aggregated all local data, passed the data through a series of internal "error checks", and then sent "error check" requests back to the local offices to verify and/or correct the data and resubmit.

DDD discontinued use of a locally maintained Access database in October 2007. The current CCMSWeb database is web-based. It is a data system that has been utilized by the CCBs for many years and provides a familiar format. The data system is designed to collect valid and reliable data that accurately reflects service delivery and practice across the state. A data dictionary was produced which explains specific data fields and provides definitions of data terminology in order to ensure consistency of data entry among individual data managers. The DDD Data Coordinator provides ongoing training and technical assistance to support the data managers and program managers in each local program. Statewide, group trainings and individual one-on-one trainings are conducted year-round as needed. Comparison of data submissions and surveys of local data providers are performed in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the trainings and inform future training topics. DDD consults with the data providers at the local programs to gather feedback about future training topics, review the data dictionary and provide input on proposed changes to the data fields. Local data providers were engaged in a pilot process of the new web-based system and are contacted on a regular basis to elicit suggestions for future fields and reports that can be used for self-assessment to facilitate the completion of accurate, valid and reliable data statewide.

DDD changed the process and requirements for submission of data by local data providers due to the conversion to a web-based data system. This process was documented and distributed to data providers and posted on the website in late Spring 2008.

Electronic data edits are in place and continue to be updated to identify errors in data field values, incomplete fields, errors in date ranges and any significant data changes. Local programs are randomly selected to perform data validity checks and compare child record data directly with database entries in order to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the Section 618 data tables submitted to OSEP. Frequent communication, in multiple formats is made with local data providers when data submission timelines are approaching to ensure that data can be submitted and any data errors are identified and corrected for timely Section 618 data submission.

DDD publishes SPP, APR and Section 618 data on the state website and distributes them in paper form when requested. Enhancements to the website are in process that will make the access and understanding of the data much clearer and easier to use. Data sources, timeframes and any limitations in reporting data (e.g., small data set, etc.) are clearly explained on publicly reported documents.

Colorado State

The 618 data tables are completed using the information in the CCMSWeb database which is verified for its validity and accuracy through multiple means throughout the course of the year. Each CCB is monitored on all the required data elements that are used in the Section 618 tables through a focused review of its data, the year end report, the twice annually analyzed database review and specific monitoring queries, through follow up self-reviews and/or state staff onsite record reviews. Periodic database training (usually two to three times annually unless needed more frequently) is provided to assure all local data managers know the most recent version of the database. The State Data Coordinator is available for technical assistance on an ongoing bases and the *CCMSWeb Early Intervention Instruction Manual* is available on the state website.

DDD has retained data reports in electronic format ongoing since 2002 and currently maintains data reports with related documentation for a minimum of three years. A formal, written contingency plan that addresses the current IDEA data management information functions is maintained by DDD. The ability of DDD to collect valid and reliable data is reviewed on a regular basis and any barriers are identified. If barriers exist, a written plan with specific strategies to overcome the barriers is generated in order to improve the data being collected and ensure accurate, valid and reliable data.

The APR has been submitted on time for the past 13 years. DDD staff will continue to submit the APR on the date determined by OSEP.

The SPP was submitted on time in February 2005 and revised and submitted on time in FFY 2006 through 2011. DDD staff will continue to submit the SPP on the date determined by OSEP.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004:

Submitted Table 1: January 2005

Submitted Tables 2-5: October 2004; October 2005 Submitted APR and Federal Application at due date in 2005

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Colorado has annually submitted 618 Tables on or before the required deadlines (see Baseline data for FFY 2004) and has an ongoing system in place to assure accurate data collection and timely submission of 618 data annually for the duration of this plan. The APR is tracked for accuracy and timely submission. The content of the SPP is tracked for timely updates and revisions to be made in future submission.

DDD used the "Indicator 14 Data Rubric" to report on all elements of this indicator.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) will be timely (14a) and accurate 14(b).
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) will be timely and accurate.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) will be timely and accurate.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) will be timely and accurate.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) will be timely and accurate.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) will be timely and accurate.
2011 (2011-2012)	100% of State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) will be timely and accurate.

2012 (2012-2013)	100% of State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) will be timely and accurate.
----------------------------	--

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

14.1	2007	The Part C database will be transferred to the CCMSWeb platform and staff will conduct training for local data managers/ DDD staff.
14.2	2007	Automated reports that can be accessed by each CCB to identify missing or incorrect data information and used for self-monitoring will be developed / DDD staff.
14.3	2007	The general supervision manual will be updated to include changes to the written notification of noncompliance and POC procedures to ensure timely correction of noncompliance/ DDD staff, CICC, NECTAC and contract staff.
14.4	2007	Public reporting and determination procedures will be revised to include more extensive criteria for measuring performance of each CCB, including timely and accurate reporting of data/ DDD staff, CICC Special Purpose Committee, NECTAC and contract staff.
14.5	2007	The Child Count data reporting date used by Colorado will be changed from December 1 to October 1 to improve the timelines for reporting data in the APR/ DDD staff.
14.6	2005-2012	DDD staff will participate in annual OSEP/Westat Part C data trainings and OSEP Annual Meetings on APR and SPP/ DDD staff.
14.7	2005-2012	DDD staff will utilize IDEAdat.org website and listserv for updated information on Section 618 reporting requirements/ DDD staff.
14.8	2005-2012	DDD staff will review and/or revise and explain changes to Section 618 Tables as requested by Westat staff annually or as needed/ DDD staff.
14.9	2005-2012	The CCMSWeb database will be updated, as needed, to include the most current required data fields to complete the Section 618 tables, APR and SPP requirements/ DDD staff.
14.10	2005-2012	DDD staff will periodically cross reference the CCMSWeb database with multiple sources of data to verify the validity and accuracy of data used for Section 618 Tables and APR information/ DDD staff.
14.11	2007-2012	Annual CCMSWeb database training on updates to the <i>CCMSWeb Early Intervention Instruction Manual</i> will be conducted to assure local data managers have the most updated information for completing the database/ DDD staff.
14.12	2007-2012	DDD will participate with interagency partners in data mapping activities to coordinate data collection throughout the state/ DDD staff and interagency partners.
14.13	2007-2012	Through regularly scheduled desk reviews of data, DDD staff will provide CCBs with reports on data accuracy and follow-up one-on-one technical assistance/ DDD staff.
14.14	2008-2012	The <i>CCMSWeb Early Intervention Instruction Manual</i> will be revised to include procedures for data entry, management, reporting timelines, confidentiality, validity and reliability, and back up safety/ DDD staff.